Class 231.3 S Book M145
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-AYL-462

THE HOLY SPIRIT

BY THE REV
A. J. MACDONALD, M.A., B.D., F.R.HIST.S.

WITH A FOREWORD BY THE RIGHT REV.
A. A. DAVID, D.D.
BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO.

231.3 S
M1d5
84054

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

LANFRANC: HIS LIFE WORK AND WRITINGS. [Oxford University Press, 12/6.]

Times Literary Supplement.—"Hitherto we have had in English no good life of him. Mr. Macdonald comes to fill the gap very well."

Manchester Guardian.—"This is a good book which will deservedly attract attention."

Quarterly Review.—"This book is one of special interest and importance."

Church Times.—"A first-rate historical study."

Church of England Newspaper.—"Very careful and thorough. All historical students will profit by reading it."

TRADE, POLITICS AND CHRISTIANITY IN AFRICA AND THE EAST with an Introduction by SIR HARRY JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G., K.C.B. [Longmans, 6/-.]

Times Literary Supplement.—"This extensive, detailed and able review."

Spectator.—"This able book."

THE WAR AND MISSIONS IN THE EAST. [Robert Scott.] (Copies from the Author only, c/o S.P.C.K., 3/- post free.)

Record.—"... discusses the condition of the three fields (India, China and Japan) politically, socially and economically with much acuteness."

Liverpool Courier.—"The whole work is a fascinating study."

FIRST PUBLISHED 1927

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

THIS book is a simple study of the doctrine of the Spirit's personality, divinity and procession in the New Testament and the age of the Fathers, and closes with a discussion of some practical modern problems. It has been written mainly for readers who have neither time nor inclination to make a critical study of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, nor even to go deeply into purely theological questions. Consequently little attention has been paid to recent treatment of textual and historical problems in the New Testament. Important though such work may be for scholars, its conclusions on the doctrine of the Spirit do not yet come within the reach of the many lay inquirers who are seeking for knowledge to-day. Scholarship has yet to make up its mind on a number of important questions. This hesitancy, which amounts sometimes almost to contradiction, is particularly evident in Dr. E. F. Scott's book, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, a book which is, in other respects, the most remarkable work on the theology of the Spirit published in English in recent years. So also, the results of modern psychological and biological research are not yet sufficiently assured to be available for a popular manual. But readers are referred to Canon C. E. Raven's brilliant Hulsean Lectures, *The Creator Spirit*, for the embodiment of these results.

However, while being written for the general reader, it is hoped that the book may be found useful to Study Circles, and members of Theological Colleges. Part II presupposes an elementary knowledge of early Church History, such as may be obtained from Canon H. N. Bate's little book. The Greek and Latin passages quoted in this section were collected many years ago, but in most cases I have given the translation of either the late Prof. Swete, or of Prof. Bethune-Baker. My especial debt to the former has been acknowledged in the footnotes. To the Bishop of Liverpool I owe not only the Foreword, but the incentive which caused me to gather together the results of earlier studies. This book was conceived at the first Synod of Liverpool, convened by the Bishop on June 29, 1925, when the doctrine of the Spirit was the subject for discussion. I have also to acknowledge several helpful suggestions from Dr. W. K. Lowther-Clarke and Dr. C. E. Raven.

A. J. MACDONALD.

September, 1927.

May the Spirit of Truth and of Life bless every reader into whose hands this book shall pass.

FOREWORD

IN these days many thoughtful people are turning their minds to the religious significance of human energy and achievement. Our new knowledge of the mechanism of the universe, and the vital power that operates it, together with our rapidly increasing control of the forces that move in it, are giving fresh impetus to the desire, always latent in all who work, to discover the source of the incentives that compel us to all kinds of mastery over the material conditions and surroundings of our lives, and no less over the hindrances that beset our moral and spiritual development. Is it possible to unify all this manifold striving by an interpretation which refers it to a single power, at work in man from the beginning, often weakened and almost extinguished by other forces to which mankind can lend itself, but sometimes barely, sometimes triumphantly, victorious? Can we see the work of the world as one, whether it be devoted to the discovery of Truth, or to the creation and expression of Beauty, or to the task of preparing the way for Goodness? Can we realise it as one because the nspiration towards each of these ends is one? And if the workers in these various fields of human endeavour were to recognise the common inspiration, and make their own several contacts with it, might we not expect a great increase of human power and achievement?

This book shows that the Christian Faith has always included the principle that the energy of men can be linked up with the energy of God. In His Spirit it has its origin, whether recognised or not, and might find in every age its direction, its reinforcement and its confirmation. But, as the author rightly points out, the exponents of that Faith have not always translated this principle in terms of human life and experience in each succeeding age. They have tended to occupy themselves with questions which concern the place of the Holy Spirit in systematic thought about the Godhead, and it is entirely necessary that we should take account of this intellectual process in the past. But the supreme need for us of to-day is to realise the part of the same spirit in modern life and work. To this need many thinkers both within and outside the Church are now ready to address themselves.

To these and others I heartily commend this book. It seems to me a timely and valuable review of human thinking about the Eternal Spirit as taught by the Bible, as developed by theologians, and as capable of a new development of vital importance to the future of religion both in the Church and in the world.

ALBERT LIVERPOOL.

September, 1927.

INTRODUCTION

DURING the days immediately before His crucifixion, Jesus promised His followers two gifts—the gift of Himself in the Holy Communion, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. By these means, compensation for His physical absence was provided. The Spirit of Jesus, offered to them in Communion, would supply them with that fellowship with God to which His earthly life had accustomed them; and the Spirit of God, who would come to them by a special endowment, would supply them with that inspiration and energy for action which hitherto they had also drawn from Him.

To the first of these gifts devoted attention has always been offered by the Church. In Western Christendom especially, the Sacrament of Holy Communion has from the earliest times been regarded as the means of access to the spiritual presence of Jesus. It has become the central act of worship in the services of the Western Church, and to join in the Communion has become not only the highest privilege but the supreme test of Church membership. But to the second of these gifts no adequate attention has been paid. The gift has been offered. It has sometimes been accepted, but only intermittently and spasmodically, and usually by sections of the Christian com-

munity like the Quakers, not by the Church generally. In her services and service-books the doctrine of the Holy Spirit finds a place, but in the life of the individual Christian, and in the work of the Church for the world, no realisation of the Spirit's presence and function, proportionate with the stress laid by Jesus upon the supreme importance of this gift, has been achieved; and even in our service-books the Spirit is allowed to enter only on specific occasions like Baptism, Confirmation and the Holy Communion.* His function and work are not stressed as the main inspiration of the Church and the individual, and yet this was the meaning of the gift of the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus.

The causes are not far to seek. The concrete symbolism of the Sacrament of Holy Communion rapidly absorbed the attention of the Church, and that which was intended to become a channel of spiritual grace commensurate with the channel of spiritual power offered in the Holy Spirit, soon monopolised the worship of Christendom, particularly in the West. The balance of devotion in services and service-books alike became one-sided, and the grace of other-worldliness was robbed of a centre of its charm and therefore of its power.

Secondly, the difficulty of understanding the

* In the Revised Prayer Book of 1927 the Epiclesis is the fourth paragraph in the Prayer of Consecration in the "Alternative Order of Communion":

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed, both in body and soul."

theology of the Spirit—His personality, His nature, His relation to the Father and the Son—has caused the plain man or woman to give up the endeavour, to rest content with the worship of Jesus in the Sacrament, and to regard the Father as the source of power and succour for daily life. Even among theological students the same difficulty has been felt, although the necessity for developing and defending the doctrine of the divine Sonship of Jesus, during the creed-making epoch, assisted in deflecting the attention of Christian thinkers from the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. At any rate, the doctrine of the Spirit since the time of the Fathers was never given that prominence in Christian apologetic accorded to the doctrine of the Son. But why, if the function and work of the Spirit were so important as Jesus promised they should be ? * Why have nearly two thousand years of Christian history been allowed to pass without a sufficient opportunity being afforded to the man in the pew to realise his heritage, to secure access to the main channel of spiritual power and efficiency, to take up the second of the great promises offered by Jesus ? Not that the Spirit has been without witnesses throughout that long period, nor that His power has not been in action, but His work has been limited, His achievement diminished, His power cramped, because the main instrument of His operation—the spirit of man—has been unaware of His approach and vigil. " Behold I stand at the door and knock," is as true of the Holy Spirit as of the Son of God, and in this day of opportunity, when the manifestations of the Spirit's power in many spheres

* Several modern writers decline to admit that the teaching came from Jesus.

of so-called secular life are abundantly clear, it is time that the Christian Church awakened to undo the door and let Him in.

A primary difficulty is the failure to apprehend the conception of the personality of the Holy Spirit. With that is related the question of His divinity, which in turn involves the doctrine of the procession. Not until the faith of the Church in the first two of these beliefs, at any rate, has been revived, will the doctrine of the Spirit become again a driving-power in the life of the Church.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
FOREWORD	v
INTRODUCTION	vii

PART I

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER	
I. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT	1
II. TESTIMONY OF JESUS TO THE SPIRIT'S PERSONALITY	13
III. THE DIVINITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	20
IV. THE ACTIVITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH	36
V. THE SPIRIT AND PERSONAL LIFE	52

PART II

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE ANCIENT FATHERS

VI. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT (Western Writers)	67
VII. THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT (Eastern Writers)	80

CHAPTER PAGE

VIII. The Divinity of the Holy Spirit (Beginning and Course of the Arian Dispute) 91

IX. The Theological Writers of the Fourth Century 101

X. The Spirit in the Being of God (The Procession Doctrine) 109

XI. Later History of the Procession Doctrine ... 118

XII. The Spirit in the Church and the World To-day 130

THE HOLY SPIRIT

PART I.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

CHAPTER I

THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT

WITHIN the limits of a handbook no attempt can be made to discuss philosophical conceptions of personality, yet some attempt must be made to define practically the significance of the term. It may be true that for purposes of abstract speculation, and to meet the demands of the pure reason, all human conceptions of personality are inadequate when the term is applied to the Being of God. At the same time, the most abstract human speculation, and the loftiest flights of human reason, cannot avoid being influenced by the source from which they arise, or at least by the instrument—the human mind—by which they operate; and human associations cannot be entirely shut out from the sphere of definition, or even of discussion. How much more, then, will the ideas of the plain man and woman be influenced in the same way; and of necessity so. Average human thought and religious devotion can be approached only by

average human channels, and the personality of the Spirit of God must be expressed in terms which have meaning for average human minds. But this contention is not a confession of failure, or, if it is, then the whole process and teaching of the Incarnation are comprised within the boundary of the failure. If God found it desirable to reveal Himself to men in human form, we need not shrink from expressing the personality of the Spirit in human terms. But, indeed, the matter should be approached from the opposite direction. The Incarnation, or the coming of the Godhead into the flesh, was really a raising of the manhood into God, and is it not clear by equal reasoning that to express the Spirit's personality in human terms is not a raising of human thought on to a level where it loses its human significance, but to one where it is increased in dignity, and therefore in meaning, by association with the Spirit's Being?

What do we mean by personality? We mean the self-conscious individuality of the living man or woman; the possession of memory, reasoning faculty, will, and hope; the consciousness of my own identity and its separateness from that of other people; the power of comparing myself with them, as a being set up over against them; the power of exerting an influence upon them, and of being influenced by them. Personality is that distinctiveness which results from the combination of consciousness, will, and power. The power of which the individual is conscious is directed by his own reason or will. Personality does not enter until there exists the capacity self-consciously to direct energy which is centred in itself. In popular estimation this necessitates the possession

of a fine physique, or personal beauty, or unusual intellectual force, which make the idea of personality more easily understood; for when ordinary men and women think of personality they do not usually think of themselves, but of other people, and particularly of those who are especially gifted in body or mind. Their conception of personality is objective, not subjective. Hence personality is really a definition of self-conscious, self-directed power as it affects us, the power or influence directed upon us by other selves. Yet this constitutes our difficulty when we try to apprehend the idea of the personality of the Spirit of God. We have but little grasp of Him as *other* and over against ourselves, like the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, or of God the Father. We use the personal pronoun "He" of both Father and Son without difficulty, but there is a strong temptation, which has tracked human thought from the beginning, to speak of the Spirit as "It." This is due partly to the early association of the idea of "spirit" with breath or wind, a conception which dominates the description of the Spirit's coming on the day of Pentecost. But the difficulty is also due to the fact that while the terms Father and Son have definite associations intimately connected with our conception of human personality, the term Spirit has none, save the material idea already mentioned. This difficulty also appears in the New Testament record, for "being born of the Spirit" was stated by Jesus to be a process as mysterious—at that day—as the blowing of the wind. There was no idea in the mind of Nicodemus to which the Lord could attach a definite conception of the Spirit's personality.

It has been suggested that in view of the Incarnation the Spirit must be like Jesus, but while human conceptions of personality, and particularly of the personality of Jesus, cannot but influence our idea of the Spirit's personality, yet to say that He must be like Jesus is surely to claim too much, and to introduce confusion into our ideas. The Son of God took up the manhood of Jesus into His divinity for a particular purpose. Unless we can prove that this was because the Godhead, generally, needed humanity for its completion, there seems little ground for suggesting that the other centres of divine Being, theologically associated with the Father and Spirit, were thereby affected, save through their relationships with the Son in the Being of the Godhead. This interpretation of the Incarnation is indeed popular just now, especially with the disciples of Dr. Temple. But if this view be pressed, it will over-stress the human aspect of personality in the popular idea of the personality of the Spirit, and will blurr the distinction which must always be kept between the human spirit and the divine Spirit.

While the ideas which we use to define, or to attempt to define, the personality of the Spirit, will inevitably be expressed by words associated with personality as we experience it in other people, and particularly as it was expressed by the human personality of Jesus, yet the effort must be made always to think of the Spirit as a living self-conscious Being, making use of His own energy and influence, but existing in a form and manner unconceived by human speculation and intelligence. Our definition of the personality of the Spirit, even the definitions of Him supplied by Jesus, are no more than descriptions in human terms of Him

who is not human, but spiritual. Defective though these definitions may be, on account of their human associations, yet, if they become the means of mediating to our own spirits the power and influence of the Spirit of God, they achieve everything that they are expected to achieve: for in the economy of existence the Spirit is to be to us the source of spiritual power and of mental illumination, not an intellectual ready-reckoner, or the mere resolvent of intellectual difficulties.

To return to our argument, we have suggested that the idea of personality includes power which is consciously self-directed, and especially power which, exerted in this way, influences and even controls the lives and welfare, the motives and wishes of other people. Does the New Testament supply us with any indication that the Spirit of God exists under these conditions, and functions in this way?

Perhaps the most remarkable record of the Spirit's personal influence is to be found in the account of His control and guidance of Jesus, particularly in the early stages of the ministry, when He was, humanly speaking, most in need of divine guidance and inspiration. It is no part of our work to discuss the extent to which Jesus was conscious in early life of His own divine identity, whether He realised it fully from the beginning, as the reply to Mary, when she sought Him among the Doctors in the Temple, suggests; or whether He gradually became aware of His unique relationship to the Father. But even if He had always been conscious of His own divinity, yet, when the time to reveal Himself to Israel arrived, His human nature was in need of some special manifestation, some particular confirmation of divine approval, if not of direct and

unmistakable guidance, in the early stages of His career. According to the Gospel records, this need was met, and to Jesus was revealed in no uncertain manner the guidance of the Spirit of God. He was taken charge of by the Spirit and received under the Spirit's influence. The Spirit brought His self-directed influence to bear upon Jesus, an influence which was so personal that our Lord felt Himself to be urged and impelled, as well as strengthened and inspired. We read that after Baptism Jesus was urged by the Spirit into the wilderness that His moral and spiritual faculties might be tested. We read that He returned into Galilee conscious that the power of the Spirit was in Him (Luke iv. 14), and that He immediately began to proclaim the fact to the Jews. Quoting Isaiah (lxi. 1–2), He said, " The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me ; because the Lord hath anointed Me to preach good tidings unto the meek ; He hath sent Me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound ; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord," and then proceeded, " To-day has this scripture been fulfilled in your ears " (Luke iv. 21). Thus was He conscious of the personal influence of the Spirit, and under the influence of the Spirit He began the great work of His ministry.

In a similar way, after Pentecost we find the apostles conscious of the control of the Spirit. Although the coming of the Spirit had been promised to them weeks before by Jesus, and although the personal nature of the Spirit had been revealed to them by Him, yet not until after Pentecost did they begin to realise that the power which fell upon them then, and the

power promised by Jesus, was the influence of a divine Person, and in the record of the Acts it is quite clearly a personal influence which takes hold of them and inspires and guides them in their work.

S. Peter was among the first to recognise the Spirit's influence, and to realise its necessity for the members of the Church. "Repent ye, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38). When Ananias and Sapphira attempted to impose a deception upon the Church, S. Peter regarded their action as an offence against the Holy Spirit. "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?" (Acts v. 3). But especially in the matter of the conversion of Cornelius did S. Peter feel that impelling and controlling influence of the Spirit, which is one of the most remarkable tributes of the apostolic Church to His personality. "And while Peter thought on the vision, the Spirit said unto him, Behold three men seek thee. But arise, and get thee down, and go with them, nothing doubting, for I have sent them" (Acts x. 19–20). Peter obeyed, and at the close of His exhortation to the household of Cornelius, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word. And they of the circumcision which believed were amazed, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. . . . Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptised, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Acts x. 44–47). Not only did S. Peter feel himself to be driven by the Spirit to go to minister to

Cornelius and his family, but he was compelled to recognise and admit the presence of the same influence operating upon them, and manifesting results similar to those experienced by the apostles at Pentecost, for we read that Peter and those present heard Cornelius and his household "speak with tongues and magnify God."

The impression made upon S. Peter by this instance of the Spirit's power was lasting. At the Council of Jerusalem, when the missionary policy of S. Paul was under discussion, S. Peter bore witness to the reality of the Spirit's influence upon the Gentile converts. "God, which knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us" (Acts xv. 8). In the judgment issued by the Council, in which Peter of course concurred, the authority of the Holy Spirit was claimed for relaxing the stringency of Jewish rites when Gentile converts were admitted to the Church, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things" (Acts xv. 28).

S. Stephen speaks of resistance to the Holy Ghost in language similar to that used by S. Peter to Ananias, but another more striking record of the apostolic consciousness of the guiding and compelling power of the Spirit is afforded by the experience of Philip the Deacon with the Eunuch. "And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip; and the eunuch saw him no more" (Acts viii. 39). Philip was constrained by a strong inward conviction, which permitted no resistance, to depart hastily from the Ethiopian, and he attributed this conviction to the impelling power of the Spirit.

The same experience was shared by S. Paul and his helpers on more than one occasion. The first missionary journey of S. Paul and S. Barnabas was undertaken under the strong conviction, not only existing in their minds, but in the mind of the Church at Antioch, that the Spirit was thrusting the two apostles out into this enterprise. "And as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. . . . So they, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, went down to Seleucia" (Acts xiii. 2, 4). On the second journey the same consciousness of the Spirit's control was with them. "And they went through the region of Phrygia and Galatia, having been forbidden of the Holy Ghost to speak the word in Asia; and when they were come over against Mysia they essayed to go into Bithynia; and the Spirit of Jesus suffered them not" (Acts xvi. 6–7). At Ephesus there was a manifestation of the influence exerted upon the Gentile converts similar to that witnessed by S. Peter in the household of Cornelius. After baptising the new members of the Church, S. Paul laid his hands upon them, and "the Holy Ghost came on them and they spake with tongues and prophesied" (Acts xix. 6).

These quotations sufficiently illustrate the argument that the apostolic Church early became convinced that it was under the guiding and controlling influence of the Spirit. From that conviction it gradually drew the conclusion that this influence was personal, within the meaning of human experience of personality. The apostolic Church gradually ceased to speak of the Holy Spirit as "It" and used the personal pronoun

"He." It may be true that there is no evidence that the apostles considered the problem of the relationship between the personality of Father, Son, and Spirit, and that there is in the New Testament evidence of confusion of thought between the conception of the Spirit of Jesus and the Spirit of God.* But no more could be expected of the Church in the first days. Definition follows, it does not precede, experience. The apostles had experience of the personal control of the Spirit. The problem of His relation to Father and Son could not be worked out at once, even if it was perceived by them. They had scarcely had time to grasp the significance of the Person and life of Jesus, when, at the very close of His career, they were further confused by His teaching concerning the Paraclete. Apostolic experience confirmed the Lord's teaching, and that experience was the result of the Spirit's influence upon the apostolic consciousness. Thus did the Spirit Himself make known His own personality, and through the medium of experience interpret to the apostles the teaching of Jesus.

So also was Pentecost interpreted to them. On the day of Pentecost, the apostles were unaware of the nature of the influence which stirred them. The Spirit appeared to them impersonally as wind and flame. This was partly due to the fact that Old Testament conceptions of divine or unusual human energy occupied their minds. The influence of the Spirit was always interpreted by Old Testament writers as a power or attribute of Jehovah. But under the influence of the Spirit's impelling and driving power, in later days they reached a conviction of His person-

* Cf. *infra*, pp. 68–69, for references.

ality, and interpreted Pentecost in the light of this conviction.

Whenever, during their ministry, signs followed their work, such as speaking with tongues, similar to those which were manifested at Pentecost, they attributed them to the same source, and reasoning backward from later experiences, realised that at Pentecost they were themselves under the influence of the personal Spirit of God.

In a similar way, the record of the visit of S. Peter and S. John to Samaria, in order to confirm the newly baptised members of the Church, is to be interpreted. An illapse of the Spirit certainly fell upon the Samaritan Christians after the laying-on of the apostles' hands. But He is described impersonally. The two apostles prayed "that they might receive Holy Spirit, and laid their hands on them." And we are told that "they received Holy Spirit" (Acts viii. 15).* It is true that this description may reflect rather S. Luke's hesitancy than that of S. Peter and S. John, but in either case it represents the uncertainty of the Church at an early period concerning the nature of the gift of the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus, an uncertainty which was gradually removed, as we have seen, by the realisation of the influence of those controlling and

* In this, as in most cases where the personal designation "the" appears before "Holy Spirit" in our versions of the New Testament, but does not appear in the Greek text, the latter has been followed. The text of our Bible translation reflects later convictions concerning the Spirit's personality, and undoubtedly describes Him as He is, and was at the time. But the Greek text reflects more accurately the development of the apostolic belief, and supports the argument of this chapter, which is derived from the effect of the Spirit's influence upon human consciousness, an influence which proved in experience to be that usually associated with personal influence.

guiding qualities always associated by men and women with personality.

No reference has been made to the part played by the Spirit in the birth of Jesus, or at His Baptism. The significance of these functions is concerned rather with the divinity both of the Spirit and of our Lord, and will be considered later. The Holy Spirit is described impersonally in S. Luke's narrative and is called "The Power of the Highest," which would overshadow Mary and cause Him who was to be born of her to "be called holy" * (Luke i. 35). At the Baptism, the Spirit appears to the few, who were vouchsafed the vision, in the form of a dove, a material representation reminiscent of Old Testament conceptions. Neither case can be quoted as an instance of the apostolic consciousness of the Spirit's personality. But in the light of later experience these manifestations of the Spirit were interpreted as evidence of His personal intervention in the life of our Lord.

* Greek text

CHAPTER II

TESTIMONY OF JESUS TO THE SPIRIT'S PERSONALITY

WE have seen that our Lord was Himself conscious that His human life and ministry were under the guidance and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. At the close of His career He promised the disciples that the same guidance and inspiration would continue and control them, "Behold I send forth the promise of My Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high" (Luke xxiv. 49). The meaning of "the promise of My Father" is given in S. Luke's other record in the Acts, "But ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost not many days hence" (Acts i. 5).

In the discourses which preceded the Passion, recounted by S. John, Jesus makes frequent allusion to the Holy Spirit. These addresses were apparently intended to explain to them the function, if not the nature, of Him who would take His place when He had left them. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may be with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; ye know Him; for He abideth with you and

shall be in you" (John xiv. 16–17). Swete points out that Paraclete "means 'Advocate' rather than 'Comforter.'" * During the days of His ministry, the defence of the disciples against criticism and attack was undertaken by our Lord. In the time which followed His disappearance from sight, the attacks, not only upon their teaching but upon their persons, would increase rather than diminish. They would feel the lack of Him upon whom they had always leaned. This lack would be supplied, and another Advocate would be sent by the Father who had originally sent Jesus. His assistance would be both psychological and practical. The world would not perceive His presence, which was perceptible only to those who had been spiritually born. But they could rest assured that the Spirit was with them. The effect of this promise upon their minds was to supply them with a spiritual self-confidence which stabilised their psychic consciousness, and provided mental balance and peace.

The influence of the Advocate would also be practical. When brought before magistrates for judgment, they were not to be anxious beforehand what they should speak, but whatever was revealed to them in that hour, they should speak, for they themselves would not be the speakers, but the Holy Spirit (Mark xiii. 11 ; Matt. x. 19 ; Luke xii. 11). No more practically comforting promise could have been made by our Lord. The natural man shrinks from examination before a legal tribunal, and is apt to give

* *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 149. Dr. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 200, contends for the interpretation "Comforter."

way to panic there more readily than on most other occasions. But under the promise of Jesus they were encouraged to leave the issue of these experiences to the advocacy of the Spirit, and to regard the future with calmness and steadiness of mind.

Another infirmity of the human intellect is the readiness with which it forgets teaching imparted to it. While Jesus was with them, the disciples scarcely felt this weakness; they repeatedly asked Him to go over His teaching again, or to expand or explain it. But when He had left them they would experience difficulty in recalling His teaching to their minds, and the difficulty would become more acute on account of the heavy responsibility laid upon them of teaching others. Perhaps it was in reply to some question asking what they should do to make up this need, that Jesus said, "The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (John xiv. 26). Weakness of human memory, insufficiency of understanding, lack of capacity to take the teaching and apply it to the needs of their hearers would all be made up by the agency of the Comforter. Moreover, the teaching of Jesus would, through them and by the aid of the Spirit, be developed and extended. "When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He shall guide you into all truth . . . and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come" (John xvi. 12–13). These words conveyed added consolation to the disciples and carried with them the promise that their own capacity would develop. Many things which Jesus could not say to them then, because they could not bear it, would be revealed to and through

them when the Spirit came. Therefore, from whatever cause they felt misgiving about their own teaching, it would be removed, whether it arose from indifferent memory or from incompleteness of knowledge.

Even so, they might still feel that their witness to Jesus was inadequate, although reinforced by the Spirit's advocacy and teaching; but all doubt upon this point could be surrendered. The reputation of Jesus would not be left entirely to them. "When the Comforter is come . . . He shall bear witness of Me; and ye also bear witness, because ye have been with Me from the beginning" (John xv. 26–27). Part of the Spirit's function would be to bear witness to the Incarnation, and to maintain and extend the authority of Christ, independently of the efforts of the disciples. Looking back from this point of time upon the chequered history of the Church, we may with confidence say that no promise of Jesus has been more completely fulfilled. Without the supernatural witness of the Spirit, the teaching of Jesus must long ago have ceased to possess influence over men.* In spite of her failures and imperfections, her desertion and her sin, the witness of the Church to Christ has been maintained by no power that is human, by no other means than the witness of the Spirit. To the same influence is due the fact that the world has never been without the conviction of sin, of righteousness and judgment. No matter how depraved the ethical consciousness of man has from time to time become, yet the sense of sin, the desire for righteousness, the fear of judgment,

* Witness the complete disappearance of the Christians in North Africa after the Muhammedan invasion of the seventh century. At one time there were in one province alone seventy bishops; cf. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, i. p. 173.

have never been entirely wanting. This also has been a fulfilment of another function of the Holy Spirit described by Jesus to the disciples. After telling them that His own departure must take place before the mission of the Spirit could begin, Jesus said, " And He, when He is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and judgment ; of sin because they believed not on Me ; of righteousness because I go to the Father and ye behold Me no more ; of judgment because the prince of this world hath been judged " (John xvi. 8–11). Thus even the most practical functions of the ministry of the disciples, the condemnation of sin, the exhortation to righteousness, the warning of judgment to come—functions which human capacity might have been expected to fulfil by virtue of human steadfastness, courage, and perseverance—were not to be left to human nature unaided. The Advocate, Teacher, and Witness would make conviction a part of His function. They would be assisted in the most practical elements of their work.

One other misgiving was removed from their minds. Would the mission of the Spirit begin an entirely new work, with new sanctions, and a new authority ? Jesus had made it clear that the function of the Spirit was distinct from His own, so distinct that the Spirit's mission could not begin until Jesus had left the world (John xvi. 7). But while there would be development of the Lord's teaching, yet the Spirit would " not speak from Himself, but what things soever He shall hear, shall He speak. . . . He shall glorify Me : for He shall take of Mine and shall declare it unto you " (John xvi. 12–14). Perfect harmony between the Son and the

Spirit would be maintained. There would be no confusion of teaching or of authority, no break in the continuity of Christ's teaching. The Spirit would be engaged in the same work as the disciples—witnessing to and teaching about Jesus.

The discourses of our Lord reported in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth chapters of the Fourth Gospel represent the Holy Spirit as a person. The functions assigned to Him are personal. No mere power or attribute, even of God, could be described as one which would fulfil the part of Advocate, Teacher, Witness, and so on. If Jesus had desired to represent the Spirit as power or attribute, He would have used language similar to that of the Old Testament. He would have promised the appearance of a prophet in whom His Spirit should dwell, or He would have confined His promise to the endowment of the disciples with this Spirit. He did indeed say that the disciples should be endowed with power from on high, but the passages in S. John xiv.–xvi. speak of a Being whose person was quite distinct from their own, who would take them under His own charge, and who in addition to filling them with spiritual power, would act independently upon their behalf; who would guide them by virtue of His own self-directed consciousness, and bring to bear upon them the influence of will and discretion and judgment, and therefore of personality. Just as during the Galilean and Judean ministries of Jesus, the disciples were taught to place themselves at His disposal, to imbibe His teaching, to follow His directions, so, after His departure from sight, they would find the place of Jesus taken by the Holy Spirit, and they were to place themselves equally unreservedly

at the Spirit's disposal. An endowment of special power and energy was also promised to them, for the strengthening and development of their own personal qualities, but over and above this endowment they would receive guidance and assistance from the divine Being, from whom this same endowment came.

CHAPTER III

THE DIVINITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

WE have now to consider the question of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. There should be less difficulty in appreciating the divinity of the Spirit inasmuch as unlike the Son He did not become incarnate. If the Incarnation has been to us a revelation of God, so that men could speak of Him as "That which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled . . . the life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us" (1 John i. 1–2), yet has it been to men at different times a cause of stumbling. Because of His humanity, men have from time to time, and especially in times only recently passed, doubted whether He was also divine. There is a perversity in human nature, which contradicts what it wants, and yet wants what it contradicts. The Spirit, like the Father, has never been incarnate, and, provided we accord assent to the teaching of Jesus, and the experience of the apostolic Church, concerning His personality, there should be little difficulty in developing belief in His divinity. But perversity enters and says that just because He has not been specially incarnate, not only the question of divinity but also that of personality is doubtful.

Yet none, save a few extreme materialists, apply the same argument to the Father, and doubt His existence because He has not been personally incarnate. Doubtless the Incarnation of the Son is a sufficient guarantee of the Father's Being and divinity, but it must never be forgotten that, although Jesus was God, He was not the Father, that although He manifested Godhead upon earth, it was in the form of Sonship, and that the Father, like the Spirit, has never appeared to men in human form. It is true that Jesus said to Philip, " He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father " (John xiv. 9). But the context makes it clear that what He meant was that He is the Way to the Father, " No one cometh unto the Father, but *by* Me ; if ye had known Me, ye would have known My Father also : from henceforth ye know Him and have seen Him " (John xiv. 6–7). We see the Father in Jesus by virtue of the relationship of the Son to the Father, not by virtue of an Incarnation of the Father in Jesus.

For the same reason it is misleading to say that we are to look for the Holy Spirit in Jesus.* Had the Spirit become incarnate we have reason for believing that He would have been a human person like Jesus. For the rest, we can only see the Spirit in Jesus by virtue of the relationship between the Son and the Spirit of God. To look for an Incarnation of the Spirit in Jesus tends to obscure the distinction of persons which it is our chief object to maintain entirely.

If by divinity we mean that which is unfamiliar to the human, that which is distinct from the human and above it in mode of being and manifestation of power,

* Cf. John vii. 39 and xvi. 7. The Spirit could not come till Jesus had left the earth.

then all that the New Testament reveals of the Spirit meets our needs. There is a sense in which the Holy Spirit is represented as more mysteriously divine than the human life of the Son, because more divinely mysterious. Yet our estimate of His divinity must be based upon something more solid than mystic instinct of this kind. This may be secured by approaching the question by way of the Spirit's relation to the Father and Son, and by way of His function.

For the purposes of this argument, the divinity of both Father and Son are, of course, assumed. It is no part of a mere handbook on the Holy Spirit to go into the arguments for Theism or the rationale of the Incarnation. Even the Trinitarian problem does not come properly within our sphere, though, indeed, to argue the divinity of the Spirit from the divinity of Father and Son, is to assume a Trinitarian hypothesis.

The close relationship between the Spirit and the other two Persons of the Trinity is described in the classical passages in S. John xiv.–xvi.* The Holy Spirit "proceedeth from the Father" (John xv. 26), or "goeth forth from the Father." It is scarcely possible to confine these words to a temporal mission, and to interpret them to mean only that the Holy Spirit would be despatched by the Father to take the place of Jesus among men. The passage does mean this, but it means much more. It describes the source of the Spirit. It describes the divine origin of the Spirit, using the terms "origin" and "source" not in the sense of beginning, but of derivation. Its

* Modern criticism disputes the authenticity of these discourses of Jesus, but they are presupposed by the vivid belief of the apostles in the Spirit from Pentecost onwards.

significance is causal not temporal. The relation of the Spirit to the Father is thus one of being, of spiritual nature. If He proceeds from the Father He is of the same being, the same Godhead, the same spiritual nature. Like the Son, He is "God of God. . . . Very God of Very God." Like the Father, He is divine. This divine Spirit the Father "will send" (John xiv. 26), in order to fulfil the function of Advocate on behalf of the disciples, referring to a point in time, when He who proceeds from the Father will be sent forth by the Father. For the fulfilment of a divine function only a divine Being can be sent. Thus the necessities of the divine economy demand that the personal Spirit should be also the divine Spirit. He who undertakes the divine mission at the behest of the Father shares in the Father's divinity.

Moreover, in the despatch of the Spirit, the Son shares. "The Paraclete . . . whom I will send unto you from the Father" (John xv. 26); and the epoch of His coming is the departure of the Son, "If I go not away the Paraclete will not come unto you. . . . I will send Him unto you" (John xvi. 7). To fulfil the divine economy the Son also sends a divine Being, one who "proceeds" from the Father and is therefore by implication—although the New Testament does not say so—one who proceeds from Himself. "I and the Father are one" (John x. 30; xvii. 11), said Jesus: "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father" (John xiv. 9). "I am in the Father, and the Father in Me" (John xiv. 10–11), "Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee" (John x. 38; xvii. 21). These passages have reference to the Godhead, in which Father and Son share, they do not suggest distribution or partaking of Fatherhood or

Sonship between Father and Son. But inasmuch as Father and Son are one God, so if the Spirit proceeds from either, He proceeds from both, from the Godhead in which both consist. This is the Catholic Faith, a faith which deduces the divinity of the Holy Spirit from recorded utterances of Jesus, a doctrine implied in the same words, words which can be pursued to no other explicit conclusion, unless we are to give to them a significance and meaning which they have never, in all literature or thought, possessed.

There is the famous passage concerning sin against the Holy Ghost, " Verily I say unto you, all their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith they shall blaspheme ; but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin " (Mark iii. 28–29). In S. Matthew and S. Luke the same is given an even more dramatic setting by means of a contrast drawn between blasphemy against the Son and blasphemy against the Spirit. " And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him : but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in that which is to come " (Matt. xii. 32 ; Luke xii. 10). The contrast is drawn between the human person of Jesus and the Spirit of God, between the human and the divine. The blasphemy is unforgivable because it is uttered against a divine Being, in some manner which has not been revealed. Whatever the significance of the saying may be, it throws into the foreground the fact of the Spirit's divinity. Only against Him who is God can any sin committed be unforgivable.

The Gospel of S. Matthew closes with the order, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19).* Even if the critical contention, that the words do not embody a saying of the Lord, be allowed, yet, being undoubtedly genuine, they do represent the faith of the apostolic Church. In this passage the Spirit is placed in the same category with the Father and Son, and into the threefold name new members of the Church are to be born. Not only, as we shall see, is the Spirit the agent of baptismal grace, He is one of its sources, and the life which the newly baptised member receives is the life which proceeds from the Spirit and from the Father and the Son. So the Spirit is a divine person, like the Father and the Son, and His divinity is equal with that of the Father and Son, at one with them, the source of our spiritual being, the object of our worship and the earnest of our spiritual hope.

If the relationships and associations of the Spirit with the Father and Son supply evidence of His divinity, the nature of His functions, as revealed in the New Testament, leads no less surely to the same conclusion.

The story of the birth of Jesus was omitted from our examination of the Spirit's influence upon the consciousness of individuals in the apostolic Church. It is not certain to what extent either S. Luke or S. Matthew regarded the intervention of the Spirit

* Cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, vi. p. 481 ff., quoted by Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 123.

on that occasion as the operation of the personal Holy Spirit, or as a manifestation of the power of God. The Greek text of the birth-stories certainly speaks of the Spirit in the third person, and if the evangelists interpreted this manifestation of power from on High as similar to Old Testament manifestations of the Spirit, which were regarded as the power of Jehovah, they had reason, in view of the Lord's words that the Paraclete would not be sent until He Himself had departed. It is remarkable that in the first three Gospel writers the Spirit is never given a personal designation, except when associated with our Lord and with His utterances or actions. Perhaps in S. Matthew's version there was an additional motive supplied by the writer's desire to represent the Gospel as a fulfilment of Old Testament prophesy and promise and hope.

However, recent criticism in Germany and this country confirms the ancient belief of the Church that the Virgin-Birth was a unique event. Leisegang maintains that the phrase "with child by the Holy Ghost" has no parallel in ancient literature, and Kittel thinks that the Messianic passages in Isaiah refer to the birth of a man who would appear to be a saviour. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke concludes that the prevalence of the idea of Virgin-Birth in the mystery religions of Egypt and Greece, and even among the Semites, is a proof of the unique nature of the New Testament event. "We are driven to the conclusion that the Christian story of the Virgin-Birth is something new," and he bases this conclusion on the contention that S. Luke would not have included a report, which so closely resembled current heathen myths, unless he

had been convinced that it was concerned with a true and unique event.*

While the consciousness of the Spirit's personality may have dawned slowly upon the apostolic mind, this does not preclude later generations from seeing in the functions performed by the Spirit, evidences of His divinity, although in the synoptic writers these may be impersonally described.

The point is, were these functions such as to require or to suggest the intervention of divinity? The appearance of Godhead in the flesh was surely such an event. The greater miracle lies rather in the fact of the Incarnation, than in the process of its initial stage. Granted that Jesus was God, then if any special agency came into action at His appearance on earth, that agency can only have been divine. Mary was promised, "There shall come upon thee Holy Spirit, and the most High's power shall overshadow thee" (Luke i. 35). In S. Matthew's account Joseph is informed that "That which was begotten in her is of Holy Spirit" (Matt. i. 18–20). The birth of Jesus, the initial act of the Incarnation, was operated by that agency which in later years the disciples, under the influence of the teaching of Jesus, and their own experience of Him, worshipped as the personal and divine Spirit. In the mystery and wonder of the Virgin-Birth we are to see the agency of a divine Being.

The same agency was at work when the time had arrived for Jesus to begin His public ministry. An

* W. K. L. Clarke, "The Virgin-Birth and Recent Discussion," in *Theology* (Aug. 1926), to whom I am indebted for the whole of this paragraph.

endowment of power was necessary to enable His human nature to begin and to maintain the preaching of the new Evangel. The object of the Incarnation was about to be fulfilled—the manifestation of the new revelation of God to man, through the human life and human teaching of Jesus. If the physical process of the Incarnation was placed under the control of the divine Spirit, how much more the manifestation of that for which the Virgin-Birth was but the preparation? If the agency of a Spirit who was divine was necessary at the Incarnation, still more should we expect to find that same Person equipping Jesus for the work of His incarnate state, and this is reported by the New Testament writers. "And John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven: and it abode upon Him. And I knew Him not: but He that sent me to baptise with water, He said unto me, Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding upon Him, the same is He that baptiseth with Holy Spirit" (John i. 32–33). The same testimony is borne by the other three Gospels, although S. Matthew, writing for the Jews, avoids the personal designation of the Spirit.*

It is not to be supposed that the symbolism of the dove was perceived by the people present, or that the voice was heard. On another occasion this same voice was interpreted by the crowd as thunder (John xii. 29). The dove was seen by John the Baptist, and was

* E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 65: "The story itself bears a stamp of authenticity, and may go back to some communication made by Jesus to His disciples." He is referring to S. Mark's account.

probably manifested to Jesus also. The testimony of the Baptist would be sufficient to account for the reference in all four Gospel writers. By this means the sublime fact that the divine person who had operated the Incarnation also endowed Jesus with power for the work of the ministry, was made known to the Church.

A similar work called for the Spirit's intervention when the apostles were waiting to be sent out from Jerusalem to carry on the work of Jesus by the continuation of the preaching. They needed to be endowed with power from on high, and this third stage in the new revelation of God to the world needed to be sponsored by a divine person. It was in keeping with the regular trend of events, that He who had operated the Incarnation and the endowment of Jesus with power, should also equip the apostles for the work of their ministry. This function was fulfilled at Pentecost. In accordance with the conceptions of that time, the Spirit is described under the symbolism of wind and fire. In the first days, as in Old Testament times, the Spirit of God was impersonally interpreted as breath and wind, but from Pentecost onwards the conviction of His personality gradually developed, carrying with it the implication of His divine nature.

With the actual form of the manifestation we are not to-day seriously concerned. There is no need to conclude that the apostles were endowed on the day of Pentecost with the capacity to speak foreign languages. The crowd around the house where they were, probably consisted mainly of Jews from the Dispersion, who had come up for the feast, from Parthia, from Media, from Elam, from Mesopotamia, Capadocia, and Pontus,

from the Roman province of Asia, from Phrygia, Pamphilia, Egypt, and Libya ; from Rome, Crete and Arabia, all of whom heard the apostles speaking with the phenomenal " glossolalia," which were manifested later in the Corinthian Church, and on other occasions. But even if the crowd consisted mainly of foreigners, it was still possible for them to be deeply stirred by the manifestation of the Spirit through the high spiritual emotion by which the apostles were moved.

" The situation may be illustrated by something which occurred at Westminster just before the war. There was then held a world-wide conference of the Salvation Army, at which were present representatives of nations even more numerous and more heterogeneous than those tabulated in Acts ii. A report of one of the meetings contains the following striking sentence : ' Each time the theme (the saving love of God in Christ) was touched upon, it brought forth from the pent-up feelings of the vast assembly a sort of half-sigh of appreciation. Yet many in the audience knew no English, but they felt that the one great truth to them was being announced at this particular moment. Indians, Chinese, Canadians, Peruvians, Swedes, all of them gave the deep emotional response.' It would not be difficult to believe that when the speaker on that occasion had finished, representatives of these various races would be found saying, ' We heard Him speaking in our tongue the mighty works of God.' " *

The power promised by Jesus had come upon the apostles. They had now been endowed with the promised gift. But of more importance was the

* *Church Times*, June 26, 1914, quoted by Dr. Anderson Scott in *The Spirit*, edited by B. H. Streeter, pp. 128–129.

realisation that this power emanated from a divine person, the divine person whose function had been outlined for them in the discourses reported by S. John (xiv.–xvi.). The manifestation and the realisation bound them together into a fellowship, a fellowship which was the beginning of the Christian Church.

Further evidence for the divine nature of the personal spirit is forthcoming in the special functions assigned to Him and fulfilled by Him in the spiritual career of each member of the Church from that day to this. In S. John iii., as well as in Acts viii. and xix., are described operations of the Spirit without which no man can be regarded as a member of the fellowship of the Christian Church. These operations are of the same nature as those performed for Jesus, and for the apostles, and illustrate the clearness with which the Spirit's divine part and function in the Church are outlined.

In the conversations with Nicodemus, our Lord emphasises the receiving and endowment of the Holy Spirit as the fundamental necessity of the spiritual life of the individual, " Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh : and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit " (John iii. 5–6). By the agency of the divine Spirit alone is the principle of spiritual life received. The new birth in the soul of man is operated by Him who mediated the Incarnation and endowed the human spirit of Jesus with power for the ministry.

Jesus described the process as mysterious, as mysterious as—at that day—the wind which " bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof,

but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John iii. 8). But the disciples, to whom had been vouchsafed the definite illapse of the Spirit at Pentecost, the new birth seemed to require not only the accompaniment of definite "signs following," but the performance of a definite material rite. When Philip returned from Samaria,* and reported to the Jerusalem Church the baptism of new members in that town, S. Peter and S. John were sent down to make inquiries. They discovered that the sacrament of Baptism had been duly performed, but that the newly baptised members had not yet received the gift of the Holy Spirit. "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts viii. 17). So, also, when S. Paul came to Ephesus for the first time, he pursued a similar inquiry. It appeared that the new converts had been baptised into the baptism of John. They were thereupon newly baptised "into the name of the Lord Jesus," and then S. Paul "laid his hands upon them, and the Holy Ghost came on them: and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (Acts xix. 5–6). It is noteworthy that the necessity for the rite of Confirmation was thus emphasised by three of the leading apostles of the Christian Church. Meanwhile, for the purpose of the argument of this chapter, both the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus, and the behaviour of the apostles at Samaria and Ephesus, confirm the evidence for the contention that the functions assigned to the Holy Spirit in the New

* Or Sichem if we read "a city of Samaria." Sichem was the centre of a sect called the Samaritans. Cf. Dr. W. K. L. Clarke in *Confirmation*, i. p. 8. (S.P.C.K. 1926).

Testament are those of a divine person. The individual Christian life is incomplete, indeed it has not begun, until it has been brought under the direct influence of this same divine person, who brings to bear upon it His own self-consciousness, self-directed power, accompanied sometimes with " signs following," and always with the capacity for the development by the individual of spiritual qualities hitherto lying dormant.

The Pauline writings are mainly occupied with a description of the nature of these qualities, and of the way in which the Spirit assists with their development in the years which follow; but they contain some passages which more especially emphasise the Spirit's personality and divinity.

The rejection of the rule of purity is equivalent to a rejection of God, " who giveth His Holy Spirit unto you " (1 Thess. iv. 8), and therefore constitutes a rejection of the Holy Spirit. The warning is reminiscent of Christ's great warning concerning blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. This passage is even more striking than that in 1 Cor. iii. 16 ff., where the warning is given against misuse of the body, which is the temple of the Spirit of God. Undoubtedly the Corinthian passage implies that sins of impurity constitute an offence against the Holy Spirit, but the Thessalonian passage teaches that such offences amount to a total rejection of the Spirit of God. A similar tribute to the Spirit's divinity is conveyed in Ephes. iv. 30, where the Church is warned against " Grieving the Holy Spirit of God."

The status of the Spirit in the Being of the Godhead—*i.e.* His divinity—is emphasised in 1 Cor. ii. 10 ff., " The Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep

things of God . . . the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God." This statement represents a development of the teaching of Jesus, who promised that the Spirit should not only bring back to their minds the things taught them by Him, but that He would develop that teaching. The statement of S. Paul carries the divine Spirit's function into the whole range of God's purposes and knowledge.

Two other Pauline passages describe unmistakably the apostle's conviction in the co-equality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son. "When the kindness of God our Saviour, and His love toward mankind appeared, not by works done in righteousness, which we did ourselves, but according to His mercy He saved us, through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by His grace, we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life" (Titus iii. 4–7).* Commenting on this passage, Professor Swete remarks, "No context in the New Testament exhibits more clearly the place of the Spirit in the economy of human salvation; its relation to the justifying grace of God, the redeeming work of our Lord, the sacramental life of the baptised, the eternal life of the saved." † But a Pauline statement which has entered more completely into the mind of the Church, and especially the Church of England, through her formularies, is to be found in the closing verse of the second Corinthian Epistle, which forms the concluding collect to our Morning and Evening Service. "The grace of the Lord Jesus

* Many scholars do not admit that S. Paul wrote this epistle.
† *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 247–248.

Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." In this passage, as in the words attributed to our Lord in S. Matt. xxviii. 19, the Holy Spirit is set up with the Father and the Son as the source of divine blessing to the Church. * If the Father is God and the Son God, so also must the Holy Spirit be God, or this and similar passages have no meaning.

Other New Testament writings do not greatly concern us in this place, although an important repetition of the Trinitarian formula appears in 1 Peter i. 2. The Epistle begins with a salutation to those who are "elect . . . according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in the sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." In the Book of Revelation the Spirit "speaks to the Churches" (ii. 7), and invites, in conjunction with the second person of the Trinity, those who thirst to come and take the water of life (xxii. 17), thus representing the Spirit, in almost the last words of the Bible, as a divine Being, fulfilling personal functions.

* Cf. Heb. ix. 14.

CHAPTER IV

THE ACTIVITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH

(a) *The Community and the Ministry*

IN the preceding pages an attempt has been made to describe the Spirit's personality by showing that the influence which He brings to bear upon men is the kind of influence which we usually associate with personality. This was followed by an attempt to describe His divinity by showing that the special functions fulfilled by Him were those which could be fulfilled by a divine person and by no other. We now turn to the characteristic New Testament teaching about the Holy Spirit—His practical work in the Church and in individuals. While no attempt is made by the New Testament writers to develop, or even to outline, the doctrine of the Spirit's personality and divinity, and while all that we learn from them on these fundamental matters is revealed by allusion and almost casual reference, much space is devoted, and in S. Paul's writings an elaborate attempt is made, to publish the doctrine of the Spirit's relation to the Church and to individuals.* The apostolic Church did

* Cf. Gore, *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, pp. 2, 38. "To be a Christian" meant "either to confess that Jesus is Lord," or "to have received the Holy Spirit."

not trouble to define the objects of its faith, although it was always zealously concerned to grasp those objects firmly. It was much more concerned with developing the results of faith in the life of the individual, and with describing this practical process.

However much the modern Church may have forgotten the Lord's second promise, namely, that He would send the Paraclete, who should take His place in the Church, the apostolic community never allowed that promise to slip from the grasp of recollection, and was constantly alert for the signs and means of its fulfilment. They were looking for its fulfilment when fulfilment came, on the day of Pentecost. The implication of the promise of Jesus was that the Paraclete would become the centre of their future unity and cohesion. On the day of Pentecost this unity came into being, when, by virtue of the vivid sensation of fellowship, inspired by the Spirit, the Christian Church was born. This bonding together of the separate units, units which may represent individual loyalties to Christ, but which are bereft of the fulness of spiritual being and of missionary effectiveness until they are made members of a fellowship, was, and is, the special and peculiar practical function of the Spirit. Before Pentecost the disciples were a loosely strung congeries of individuals, liable to " go a fishing," or to give way to intellectual doubt, and at the most only capable of gathering together and waiting to see what would happen next. But after the illapse of the Spirit on that day they realised that they were members one of another, with a common vision, a common feeling, inspired by a common spirit of power. Nor was this experience confined to that day. On more than one

occasion when a number of them were gathered together, the mere local association of these Spirit-filled men produced the Pentecostal signs, emotions and power. When Peter and John were released from an examination by the Council, and had returned to the rest of the brethren, and "when they had prayed, the place was shaken wherein they were gathered together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness" (Acts iv. 31). To new converts was granted a similar realisation of fellowship. Peter testified that on the household of Cornelius "the Holy Ghost fell . . . even as on us at the beginning," and "they heard them speak with tongues, and magnifying God" (Acts x. 46; xi. 15). The twelve men who were confirmed by S. Paul at Ephesus "spake with tongues and prophesied" (Acts xix. 6).

This participation in the same power and the same gifts developed the sense of corporate unity, and, what was of still more importance, deepened their conviction that as a body they were indwelled by the Spirit. Offences against the fellowship were regarded as offences against the indwelling Spirit. When Ananias and Sapphira attempted to deceive the Apostles, they were charged with lying not unto men, but against the Holy Ghost (Acts v. 3); they had tempted the Spirit of the Lord (Acts v. 9). S. Stephen charged his persecutors with resisting the Holy Spirit (Acts vii. 51). Simon Magus was told that he had "neither part nor lot in this matter," because his heart was "not right with God" (Acts viii. 21). He had offered money to secure the power of conferring the Holy Spirit. It was denied to him because he had

not part or lot in the Spirit-filled community. Their fellowship in evangelistic work was a corporate experience of the Spirit's directing influence. When the Church in Antioch was planning the first missionary enterprise to the Gentiles, it seemed to them that "the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them" (Acts xiii. 2). At the Council of Jerusalem, the decision of the assembled Church was given in the name of the Spirit, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us" (Acts xv. 28). But on no occasion was the sense of corporate fellowship and unity in the Spirit more complete than when the Church experienced deliverance from persecution or joy at the gathering in of new converts. After the cessation of Saul's persecution "the Church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace, being edified; and, walking in the fear of the Lord and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, was edified" (Acts ix. 31). At Iconium "the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Ghost" (Acts xiii. 52).

In course of time it became necessary to guard this realisation of the fellowship. As the Gospel spread among the Greek cities, the unity of the growing Church became threatened by the individualistic tendencies of Greek life and manners. In maritime places like Corinth, where the gathering together of men of different race and speech drives the individual in upon himself, partly in self-defence, and partly as the only means of gaining an opportunity for self-expression, the prevalent individualism broke out among S. Paul's converts. A sectarian attitude had entered the Christian community, individual loyalties

were springing up, which threatened the unity of the Church in the Spirit. "One saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; another, I am of Cephas" (1 Cor. iii. 4, 22). As a remedy, S. Paul reminded them of their corporate unity in the Holy Spirit. "Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you" (1 Cor. iii. 16). "For in one Spirit were we all baptised into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. xii. 13).

An even greater schism in the fellowship was threatened by the dissension between Gentile and Jewish Christians. Into this schism religious tradition, as well as racial rivalry, threatened to enter. S. Paul wrote to the Ephesians in a tone conciliatory to Jewish elements in the Church. "Wherefore remember, that aforetime ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision in the flesh, made by hands; that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. . . . For through Him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father . . . so also ye are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit" (Eph. ii. 11–13, 18, 22). "I therefore beseech you . . . to walk worthily . . . giving diligence to keep of the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit" (Eph. iv. 1–4). The bond of their unity is the Spirit, and no racial antipathy or religious tradition is to be allowed to cause them to

forget the agent of their fellowship, or their obligation to manifest the same Spirit of unity to the world.

The indwelling Spirit of the Church manifests Himself in special forms through the many but particular gifts assigned by Him to the representative ministers of the Church. Through the special gifts of the ministry, some of the more characteristic activities of the Spirit are mediated to the larger body of the fellowship and to the world. It is true that each member of the fellowship shares in the ministry, each possesses a "holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus" (1 Pet. ii. 5). The members of the Church are "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (1 Pet. ii. 9). They were "made . . . to be priests of God and of Christ" (Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6). But the New Testament also assigns to particular members of the Church special ministerial functions, which are regarded as the instruments of special manifestations of the Spirit's power, granted for the benefit of the whole Christian community and for the world.

Even before Pentecost, the twelve had received an unusual gift of the Spirit from the lips of Jesus Himself. We are told that He breathed on them, and saith unto them, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosesoever sins you forgive, they are forgiven unto them: whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx. 22–23).* Whatever else binding and loosing power may have meant, it conveyed to the twelve a peculiar endowment of the Holy Spirit. The gift of

* On this passage cf. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke, *Confirmation*, i. pp. 16, 20.

the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was another special endowment for the fulfilment of their special work, equivalent to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His Baptism. The apostolic Church regarded the episcopal function as being specially authorised by the Holy Spirit. In S. Paul's tabulation of ministerial offices, the overseers are given a prominent place, and on his departure from Ephesus he warned them, saying, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood" (Acts xx. 28). This is not the place to enter into a discussion upon the relation of the episcopate to the presbyterate. It is sufficient if we note that from the highest office in the Church, whether that office be episcopal or presbyterian, down to the lowest, the official is regarded by the apostolic Church as being especially endowed by the Holy Spirit for the performance of his duty.

The theory of the ministry is worked out at length by S. Paul: "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of working, but the same God, who worketh all things in all. But to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to profit withal. For to one is given through the Spirit the word of wisdom; and to another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit; to another faith, in the same Spirit; and to another gifts of healings, in the one Spirit; and to another workings of miracles; and to another prophecy; and to another discernings of spirit; to another diverse kinds of tongues; and to another the interpretation

of tongues ; but all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally as He will" (1 Cor. xii. 4–11). In this list of spiritual gifts several of the particular functions of the ministry are enumerated. But the list must be examined in conjunction with another passage in which S. Paul more definitely ascribes the gift of the ministry to the agency of the Holy Spirit—"giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit . . . but unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gifts of Christ . . . And He gave some to be apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers ; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ" (Eph. iv. 11–12).

Through the duly authorised and accredited ministry the general priesthood of the Church is mediated. But the source of authority, the agent of all credentials, the fountain of special knowledge and the giver of particular gifts, is the Spirit of God, who indwells the whole body of the Church and directs her energies through the action of the ministry and people alike.

(b) *Prophecy and Inspiration*

The apostolic Church was conscious that Jesus had promised that the Spirit would recall His teaching to the apostles and that He would develop it (John xiv. 26 ; xvi. 13). Inspired teaching would be revealed to them. One of the functions of the Spirit would be to guide the Church to a right selection of

teaching already given, and of truth already revealed. There would be a secondary revelation of truth already revealed, a secondary inspiration, enabling those so inspired to decide whether teaching already given was inspired or not. Perhaps this forms the more important aspect of inspiration. The leading apostles, like the great prophets, seldom fail to realise when new spiritual truth was being revealed through their own agency. S. Paul was more than once conscious that His teaching proceeded from the Spirit. But the treatment of S. Paul, at the hands of S. Peter and the Jerusalem Church, shows that those who heard the teaching were not always able to perceive its source and authority. There was need of the Spirit's aid to take of the things which were His own, which had already been revealed, and make them known to the consciousness of the Church, or, conversely, to inspire the Church to apprehend what had already been revealed through the channel of inspired prophets and writers. An illumination of the Spirit is as necessary for him who hears and reads, as for him who prophesies or writes, an illumination of "the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, for it beholdeth Him not, neither knoweth Him; ye know Him; for He abideth with you and shall be in you" (John xiv. 17). The difference between a man of the world and a man of the Church is that the latter, being filled with the Spirit, is able to understand the things of the Spirit, and especially to perceive the due import of truth revealed by the Spirit in generations gone by.

This ministry of the Spirit is seen operating in the attitude of the New Testament writers to the Old

Testament. Indeed, generally, the apostolic writers were more conscious of inspiration in the Old Testament books than in their own sayings and writings. David spake "by the mouth of the Holy Ghost" (Acts i. 16). "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed" (Gal. iii. 8), where "the scripture" obviously refers to the Spirit, who is the agent mentioned in the context (cf. *v.* 3). This attitude towards the Old Testament, by which the authority and agency of the Spirit were recognised to be behind Old Testament prophecy, was encouraged by our Lord, even if we may not say that it was definitely introduced by Him. "Jesus answered and said . . . David himself said in the Holy Spirit" (Mark xii. 36). Even when allowance has been made for the fact that the revelation of God in Christ Jesus was regarded by the apostolic Church, and particularly by writers like S. Matthew, as a fulfilment of ancient Jewish prophecy, and a continuation of the old Jewish system, yet independently of Jewish preconception, the conviction was impressed forcibly upon the apostolic mind that the Holy Spirit was He who "spake by the prophets."

So, in turn, later ages have regarded the New Testament writings, and by this means the canon of the New Testament was built up. Experience of the greater spiritual value of some writings, guided by the spiritual insight of the Church, which was in turn under the influence of Him whose function was to take of the things of Jesus and reveal them to men, enabled the Church in sub-apostolic and later days to make

a selection from the writings of apostolic times, and to present it with so complete an authority that there has been little attempt to detract from or add to the canon from that day until the present. Although 2 Peter does not belong to apostolic times, and the Epistle to the Hebrews has been mistakenly assigned to S. Paul, yet the renewed authority which has been accorded to most of the books of the New Testament by the modern Church, since they have come out of the crucible of the searching criticism of modern scholars, is a vindication of the Church's reliance upon the Spirit's guidance. For practical purposes this secondary revelation of the Spirit, this secondary inspiration of the faith and judgment of the Church, is as important as the primary inspiration which guided the original writers in their selection of matter to commit permanently to the keeping of posterity.

While not claiming verbal, or even, perhaps, plenary inspiration, the apostolic writers from time to time wrote consciously under the influence of the Spirit, and openly acknowledged His aid. Swete stressed too strongly the contrast between the attitude of the apostolic writers to Old Testament inspiration, and their attitude to their own writings. It may be true that "there is no indication that any of the apostolic writers was conscious of contributing to a second canon of inspired scripture," * and that "no ulterior purpose of creating a Christian literature or of ministering to the spiritual needs of posterity appears on the surface of the books." But how far were the Old Testament writers conscious that they were writing for the future? If the authority of the Old Testament

* *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 333.

canon was derived from a sanction supplied by later generations, then the apostolic writers were also entitled to leave the question of the inspiration of their writings to the future, and whether they were conscious of inspiration or not, the fact of inspiration remains. Moreover, the contrast drawn by Swete suggests that the apostolic age regarded the Old Testament canon as definitely closed. So far as it was regarded as a revelation to Judaism, this may be conceded, but the apostolic Church regarded the Old Testament scriptures as part of its own heritage, and as that heritage was for the present and the future, they can scarcely have regarded the age of revelation, and therefore of inspired writing, as closed.

The real question, as Swete somewhat hesitatingly admits,* is how far were the New Testament writers conscious of the Spirit's guidance? With the recollection of the words of Jesus (John xiv. 26) in mind, they must have relied upon the Spirit's help for their work. The question of method does not enter. Swete surely claims too much when he says, "S. Luke writes as if he had depended entirely on his own researches; and if S. Luke and the writer of the first Gospel had S. Mark before them, as is now commonly supposed, they certainly treated the second Gospel with a freedom which suggests that they did not recognise it as inspired scripture"† But this is equivalent to saying that the consciousness of inspiration necessitates the dismissal of common sense, and the blinding of the writer's

* "It is a somewhat different question how far, while writing letters and books which were designed to meet the immediate needs of individuals or Churches, they were conscious of being assisted by the Holy Spirit" (*The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 334).

† *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 335.

intelligence by a supernatural agency. Inspiration is not concerned with method, but with content and result, and the contents of an inspired writing may be legitimately tested, sifted and rearranged to meet the necessities and objects of a later writer, also writing under the influence of the Spirit.

Again, Swete's contention that "the promise that the Paraclete would recall to memory the words of Christ found its fulfilment in the apostolic preaching and in the oral tradition of the first age rather than in the written Gospels which are based on them," * appears to draw an altogether unnecessary distinction between oral tradition and the New Testament writings, and, in effect, denies to the Gospels the authority and character of inspired books. The first and second Gospels open with a declaration of their objects which may not make any claim to authoritative utterance, but the words "the book of the generation of Jesus Christ" (Matt. i. 1) and "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (Mark. i. 1), carry with them their own authority. The contents of a record of the generation and Gospel of Jesus were inspired, in so far as they constituted a record of the events of His inspired life. In the case of the third and fourth Gospels, a claim to have made use of that oral tradition, which Swete admits was under the influence of the Spirit, is surely present. S. Luke begins by claiming the authority of eye-witnesses, of those who delivered the traditions (Luke i. 1). To the fourth Gospel is appended the testimony of the Church that the contents of the Gospel were witnessed by him who wrote them down (John xxi. 24).

* *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 335.

Swete admits that the Epistles of S. Paul "contain the substance of divine revelations," * and in S. Paul's writings we certainly meet with unmistakable claims to the Spirit's inspiration. Speaking of the "things which eye saw not," S. Paul continues, "But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit" (1 Cor. ii. 10). "By revelation was made known unto me the mystery . . . as it hath now been revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (Eph. iii. 3–5). "I think that I also have the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. vii. 40). Elsewhere he claims the authority of revelation through the first and second persons of the Trinity. "For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came unto me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 12); "But when it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me" (Gal. i. 15–16).

The claim of the writer of the Revelation to the Spirit's inspiration is too well known to need further discussion: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day" (Rev. i. 10); "He that hath an ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches" (Rev. ii. 7, etc.).†

We may agree with Swete that "of the nature and effects of Inspiration the writers of the New Testament say but little." ‡ The age of definition had not arrived. The Hebrew, and with him the apostolic Christian, did not ask "How?" He was content to judge of phenomena as well as facts by results. If his own

* *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 334.

† But cf. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 212–219, for a different estimate of the teaching in the Apocalypse.

‡ *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 336.

spiritual experience was enriched, he saw the hand of God behind facts and phenomena alike. So he judged of Old Testament prophecy. Although the men of the prophets' day rejected the testimony, probably because no immediate spiritual results could be perceived, yet later generations saw the effects of the prophets' ministry upon their own day, and realised its significance for the future. So they decided who were Spirit-filled, who inspired. Not every prophet was inspired, and only those who seemed to be Spirit-filled were admitted to the canon. The same principle was at work in apostolic days. "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit which confesseth that Jesus is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit which confesseth not Jesus is not of God" (1 John iv. 1–3). The Spirit's prophetic function in the Church was fulfilled by testifying to Jesus. "He shall witness of Me" (John xv. 26). "It is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth" (1 John v. 6).

S. Paul carried the application of the principle a stage further. He applied it to the books of the ancient canon. Although he taught that the Old Testament scriptures "were written for our learning, that through patience and comfort of the scriptures we might have hope" (Rom. xv. 4), yet some "scriptures" were not inspired of God. Those which were so "inspired" were profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness (2 Tim. iii. 16, R.V.).* Here is the

* It is possible that the contrast here is between Holy Scripture

beginning of a theory of inspiration which is certainly not verbal, a theory which appears to admit that for some "scriptures" the Spirit's inspiration is not necessary. When "scripture" is concerned merely with human events, which are verifiable by human industry, either of the writer, or of later generations, there is but little need of the Spirit's inspiration, but when the "scripture" deals with spiritual truth, the Spirit's function becomes operative, and although the account of the writer may still be influenced in small points of detail by the defects of human memory or judgment or industry, still the main argument is controlled by the Spirit, and "scripture" is a revelation. The extraordinary unanimity of the writers of the New Testament points to some guiding influence which is more than the unanimity attained by different human intellects when they perceive the same facts, it points to the operation of Him whose supreme prophetic function was "to guide into all truth" (John xvi. 13), both by guiding the spiritual insight of those who wrote the "scripture," and by guiding the judgment of those who read them, and made selections of some in preference to others, because of the different spiritual value of different writings.

and other writings outside Scripture. Many authorities do not admit the Pauline authorship of 2 Timothy.

On the use made by the apostles of written documents, cf. Dr. V. Burch, *Jesus Christ and His Revelation* (1927). Dr. Burch, quoting the Russian version of Josephus, maintains that the Jews encouraged the disciples to make and preserve records of His sayings. Cf. Dr. S. J. Appasamy, *Christianity as Bhakti Marga*, pp. 169, 170, on the relation of the Spirit to inspiration.

CHAPTER V

THE SPIRIT AND PERSONAL LIFE

(a) *The Teaching of St. Paul*

SINCE the days when the men of the nineteenth century were saying, " 'Tis life whereof our nerves are scant," no teaching has been of more significance for the modern Church than the doctrine of the New Testament on the Spirit's relation to personal life. Yet the Church has largely failed to apprehend the source from which the need of her members might be supplied. The writers of the Reformation placed the doctrine of sanctification in the front of their message. They at least realised the practical nature of Christ's promise that the Spirit should take His place as the inspiration of individual life when He had departed from sight. If the doctrine of His presence in the Eucharist received less attention at their hands, that was not because they did not realise the meaning of sacramental grace, but rather because the other channel of spiritual grace, the Spirit's indwelling, had been so largely neglected by the mediaeval Church.* To-day our need is similar, and we begin to perceive it. The voice of the Spirit is calling the Church to a realisation of

* But cf. H. Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church.*

the need of her members, but as the theatre of the Spirit's operation is the spirit of man, the Spirit of God is hindered until man answers to the voice.

In the book of the Acts and in the Epistles of S. Paul * there is scarcely a chapter in which the realisation of the Spirit's relation to personal life is not present. The apostolic Church took Christ at His word, and if they met weekly and sometimes daily for the breaking of the bread,† they were in constant communion with the indwelling Spirit. It will be sufficient for our purpose if we confine our attention to the teaching of two writers, whose treatment of the Spirit's relation to personal life is so complete, that it almost amounts to a developed doctrine.‡

Although S. Paul's psychology does not commend itself altogether to modern thought, yet his teaching that the human spirit is the sphere of operation for the divine Spirit is not likely to be contested to-day. The Old Testament writers were aware of the Spirit's action upon inanimate nature, and they attributed any unusual manifestation of power by the human spirit to the intervention of the Spirit of Jehovah, but not until New Testament times was it realised that the spirit of man was not only the channel for abnormal manifestations of spiritual power, but the theatre of the Spirit's general and characteristic work, and that provided man supplied Him with the opportunity, the Spirit came not spasmodically and intermittently, but remained as an abiding source of life and as the

* There are comparatively few references to the Spirit in the later epistles of the New Testament.

† Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7, 11.

‡ The rest of this chapter is based on Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 340–351.

agent of righteousness. Moreover, there is a marked contrast between the teaching of Old and New Testaments upon the nature of the Spirit's work in and for man. The Old Testament regarded the Spirit as a source of achievement or of success or of power, whether physical or intellectual. The New Testament, while attributing to Him these particular modes of operation, yet emphasised rather the permanent ethical activities of the Spirit of God.

S. Paul teaches that the sphere of this activity is the human spirit. "The Spirit of God beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God" (Rom. viii. 16).* The spirit of man is in him before the Spirit of God begins to operate upon him. The spirit of man is not created within the individual by the Spirit of God. It is an independent agent, with an independent sphere of activity. "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man, which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 11). There is no necessary affinity between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God.† The relationship must be consciously established by the response of the spirit of man to the Spirit of God. So Jesus warned the Church that the world could not receive the spirit of truth, because it did not behold Him, and did not know Him (John xiv. 17).

The beginning of this contact between the spirit of man and the Spirit of God is established at Baptism,

* Cf. Gal. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Philem. 25.

† In so far as the spirit of man was created by God, an affinity between God and man exists. But to conserve the conception of "divinity," we must maintain a fundamental difference between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man.

" through the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," which He poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour (Tit. iii. 5–6).* But Baptism is only the beginning of a process. It is in no sense regarded as an instant or complete resurrection of the spirit of man from death to life. The flesh remains, and the flesh has to be overcome. The Spirit of God, received in Baptism, comes in contact with the flesh. The nature of the antagonist is not left in obscurity. The Spirit's contest is not with the influence of the world without on the flesh, but with the moral depravity of the flesh within. " Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would. But if ye are led by the Spirit ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, sorcery, enmities, strife, jealousies, wraths, factions, divisions, heresies, envyings, drunkenness, revellings, and suchlike " (Gal. v. 16–21).† By the Spirit's assistance the flesh is to be overcome. We are not " to grieve " Him " into whom we were sealed " ‡ in Baptism, but to allow Him freedom to combat the flesh so that we are renewed in the spirit of our minds (Eph. iv. 23). The habits of life become transformed as the Spirit gradually overcomes the adversary, so that the works of the flesh are displaced by the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 24).

* That S. Paul dates the beginning of the higher spiritual life in man from Baptism is made clear by his doctrine of Baptism as a burial and resurrection with Christ (Rom. vi. 3–5).

† Cf. Rom. viii. 5–8. ‡ Eph. iv. 30.

But the work of the Spirit of God within the human spirit is not only remedial, it is preventive; it is not confined to breaking down evil, it is concerned with constructing a new life within the spirit of man. This is that process of sanctification, a process assigned by the apostolic writers to Jesus Christ as well as to the Holy Spirit, but which the Church has probably quite rightly regarded as a particular function of the Spirit. "No one term, indeed, so fully covers the effects upon human nature of the presence in it of the Holy Spirit of God as the word 'sanctification.' It expresses at once the hallowing or consecration to the service of God which is the first result of the coming of the Spirit, and the actual equipment for the service of each of the faculties of men." * So S. Paul speaks of being "sanctified" by the Holy Ghost (Rom. xv. 16) for the work of the ministry. The Corinthians "were washed . . . sanctified . . . justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor. vi. 11). He rejoiced over the Thessalonians because God chose them from the beginning "unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit" (2 Thess. ii. 13). So actual and definite was the process of sanctification that the physical nature of an unbelieving person is consecrated by wedding with a Christian. "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother" (1 Cor. vii. 14).

The results of sanctification are twofold. They are manifested towards God and towards man. With a growing sense of the Fatherhood of God is developed a responding sense of Sonship. A filial relationship

* Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 345.

towards God is established in the human heart by the agency of the Spirit. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again unto fear; but ye received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him" (Rom. viii. 14–17). "And because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father. So that thou art no longer a bondservant, but a son; and if a son, then an heir through God" (Gal. iv. 6–7). Our filial relation to the Father, established by the Spirit, creates a spiritual kinship with the Son, so that we share in the rights of sonship belonging to the Son, becoming joint heirs with Him of the Father's grace.

From this new relationship springs the two chief spiritual activities of the human life—prayer and discipleship. ". . . we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit Himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and He that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. viii. 26–27). The Spirit of God inspires the activity of prayer in the human heart, * and at the same time intercedes for it, independently, with God. Thus prayer is revealed to be, not a capricious or spasmodic activity conditioned by and dependent on the will of man, but part of the

* Cf. Jude 20.

function of the Spirit of God, operating in the human heart, and interceding with the Father. It is part of the one activity of the Spirit which embraces the whole Spirit-filled creation. Time and space, which appear to separate men and women from each other, are thus shown to be overcome—indeed, to be non-existent in a spiritual society, a spiritual organisation, compacted together by the indwelling praying Spirit, and supervised by the transcendent interceding Spirit. In man the Spirit prays for man. In God the Spirit intercedes for man. The channel of our spiritual communications with each other and with God is the Spirit, so that though I am separated by half a hemisphere from man, and by the barrier of the flesh from God, yet am I drawn close to both alike by the medium of the Spirit, who prays in me and in my friend across the seas, and who intercedes for me and for him in God.

Discipleship in the school of the Father, which commenced when Jesus gathered around Him a band of twelve scholars or learners, has been transferred to those who have succeeded the original disciples, and to the Spirit who now fulfils the functions of Jesus in the world. To learn about God, to continue acquiring knowledge of God is, with prayer, the chief spiritual activity of the baptised members of the Church. Through the agency of the Spirit divine knowledge is conveyed to us. " But we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the world unto our glory : which none of the rulers of this world knoweth : for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. . . . But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit : for the

Spirit searches all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we receive not the Spirit of the world but the Spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man" (1 Cor. ii. 7–15). For this Spirit of knowledge or discipleship S. Paul prays, on behalf of the Ephesians, "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation of Him" (Eph. i. 17).

The sense of Sonship, the activity of prayer and discipleship, combine to generate that love towards God which is yet another function of the Spirit's operation upon personal life, "the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us" (Rom. v. 5). Now has been reached the condition of peace and joy and hope which are the natural accompaniments of Sonship and love. This is that final stage of rest which is the experience of every true mystic * whose broken nature

* Dr. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 158, 245, assigns the doctrine of the Spirit to a *magical* or mystical origin. But magical religion is so antipathetic to mystical conceptions that it is difficult to understand how the two ideas can be placed in the same field of reference.

has become occupied by the Spirit, who, in turn, has restored it, and brought it, by prayer and knowledge, into a realisation of its filial relationship to God, and into the love, joy and peace, which that state brings with it. "For the Kingdom of God is . . . peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv. 17). "The God of Hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xv. 13); "Be ye imitators of us, and of the Lord, having received the word with much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost" (1 Thess. i. 6).

Towards men, towards other members of the Spirit-filled community—the Church—the results of sanctification are equally clearly manifested. The list of the nine fruits of the Spirit begins with the enunciation of the three conditions which, as we have seen, accompany the new spiritual filial relationship to God—"love, joy, peace." The context makes it clear that these graces are exhibited towards other men and women by the sanctified human heart. They are drawn up in contrast with the works of the flesh, which cover the whole range of evil relations between men and women. By contrast, the fruit of the Spirit, offered as a harvest of the sanctified heart, to other people, is "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22–23). Life in the Spirit is to be manifested by conduct in the Spirit. "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk. Let us not be vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another" (Gal. v. 25–26).

The whole range of a man's relationship in personal and social life is covered by the list of graces contained in this passage. They include those qualities of

courtesy, forbearance, charity, integrity, sincerity, loyalty, modesty towards others, inspired by cheerfulness and self-control, which constitute the standard, not only of the Spirit-filled man, but of a type of manhood which has for long evoked the admiration of men of the world. The defects of the "boor" are outlined in S. Paul's list of the works of the flesh (Gal. v. 19–21). Here are outlined qualities which even the civilisations of this world attribute to him whose life and conversation always befit the occasion, and who is "never unintentionally rude."

But S. Paul does not remain content to deal with generalities. Specific offences committed by Christians are particular sins against the Holy Ghost. For example, if within the bonds of marriage the unbelieving husband or wife is sanctified by the believing partner, even so, unions which are not hallowed by matrimony have a spiritual effect, only it is an evil effect. "He that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication. Every sin that a man doeth is without the body; but he that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body. Or know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is within you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; for ye are bought with a price; glorify God therefore in your body" (1 Cor. vi. 17–20). The doctrine of sanctification is no mere theological fancy, or pious aspiration. It is indeed that teaching which makes known to the individual that his life is Spirit-filled, but it is intended to encourage very practical results. If there are fruits of sanctification, and fruits of the Spirit, so, indeed, the presence of sanctification is proved by the

production of the fruits. If sanctification is offered as an aid against the grossest sins of the flesh, so, on the contrary, are those sins, when committed by a baptised member, an offence against the Holy Spirit. But if sanctification, by virtue of earnest endeavour on the part of the individual, is real, then " the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you " . . . " the body is dead because of sin ; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness " (Rom. viii. 11, 10). It is certain that impurity, whether of mind or deed, effectively drives the consciousness of the Spirit's presence from the soul of the believer.

(b) *The Teaching of S. John*

To S. Paul we owe the practical application of the doctrine of the Spirit to the needs of common life—whether spiritual or material. In the Fourth Gospel we have an indication of the source from which S. Paul received this doctrine. It is improbable that S. Paul ever saw the pages of S. John's Gospel. But S. John records teaching of Christ which was prevalent in the Church, and from which S. Paul drew his doctrine, and then shaped it to meet the practical needs of the Gentile Churches.

According to S. John, the new personal spiritual life begins with Baptism. In the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus said, " Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God " (John iii. 5). This doctrine of the necessity for Baptism S. Paul

placed at the front of his message, but he interpreted the process in a different way. In S. Paul's teaching the function of the Spirit in Baptism is concerned with cleansing from sin, and burial with Christ, and when the newly baptised convert steps out of the water, it is equivalent to rising from the dead. In S. John's teaching the conception was different. A man must be "born again." No mere renewal or restoration, but the origination and the preservation of the new life, are the results of the Spirit's action in Baptism.*

This contrast in the Spirit's function arises from different conceptions or uses of the term "flesh." To S. Paul "flesh" describes the moral corruption of human nature.† It describes, not merely ethical insufficiency, but deficiency, and is related rather with sins of commission than omission. Hence the apostle's repeated reference to sexual offences. But in S. John's teaching the "flesh" signifies the principle of animal life. It describes the natural man in contrast with the spiritual man, the natural man as he is before the Spirit comes to him in Baptism. There is no necessary connection in S. John between the flesh and moral corruption. The flesh propagates itself by physical means, and it can do no more, hence the need for new birth, birth of the Spirit. ‡

The Spirit which regenerates personal life also maintains it. In the conversation with the woman

* But in Rom. viii. 15, S. Paul refers to the "Spirit of adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father."

† Dr. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 133, attributes the Pauline doctrine of the flesh to Greek sources. But surely this idea is rather Oriental than Hellenistic in origin; cf. Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, ii. p. 25.

‡ Cf. A. J. Appasamy, *Christianity as Bhakti Marga*, pp. 130–146.

of Samaria, when standing by the well, Jesus said, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall become in him a well of water springing up into eternal life" (John iv. 14). The meaning of that saying was given when He cried in the temple at the Feast of the Dedication, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." "But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him are to receive," comments S. John (John vii. 37–39).

"Out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water"; the new life of the Spirit communicated to the individual cannot be retained by him solely for his own spiritual nourishment. It must be communicated to others. Then the new personal life in the Spirit is a life of fellowship. It operates upon the community. If the Spirit of God creates and maintains the personal life of the individual, He only does so in so far as the individual is a member of the body of the Church. He does not create a number of isolated spiritual units. He indwells a fellowship, a community, and increases the fellowship by using individuals as channels of life-giving grace. The personal life of the believer cannot be enjoyed for himself alone. Here is the condemnation of all spiritual egotism, indeed of egotism in all its forms. We are compelled by the operation of Him who indwells us to take note of others. We cannot be satisfied with our own standards only. We are part of the Spirit-filled fellowship, and if our lives are not helping the lives of others, we have cause to doubt our own membership in the body.

(c) *The Spirit and the After-Life*

In the first section of this chapter, quotations from S. Paul's Epistles connected the Spirit's influence with the after-life. S. Paul makes no attempt to pierce the veil of the future. That is left to the writer of Revelation, whose apocalyptic pictures can indeed be assigned to the Spirit by inference. The teaching of S. Paul, like the teaching of Jesus, reported by S. John, emphasises mainly the Spirit's influence upon personal life in this world. But as the life upon which the Christian enters at conversion and Baptism is immortal, allusions to the next stage of our existence creep into S. Paul's letters. The preparation of the Spirit for that life appears to be twofold. A feature of His teaching function is to make known to us our destiny, " The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God : and if children then heirs ; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ : if so be that we suffer with Him, that we may be also glorified with Him " (Rom. viii. 16–17 ; cf. Gal. iv. 7).

Secondly, the Spirit supplies us with the principle of immortality, and will operate for us victory over death. " But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you " (Rom. viii. 11). In this preparation for the after-life we ourselves share by submitting our spirits to the influence of the Spirit of God, " for he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth unto the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap eternal life " (Gal. vi. 8). For this teaching of S. Paul, confirmation

is to be found in S. John's reports of our Lord's sayings. The water of the Spirit which Christ gives is offered not only as a means of maintaining the spirit of a man in this life, but is "a well of water springing up into eternal life" (John iv. 14). Indeed, all spiritual nourishment, including the food of the Holy Eucharist (John vi. 54), is according to S. John a feeding of the soul in preparation for the life to come. If the personal life of man is indwelled by the Spirit, so that the fruits of the Spirit may be produced for the benefit of the spiritual fellowship to which the individual belongs, none the less is there an intrinsic value in the personality of individuals, worthy of being preserved to the next life, and it is part of the Spirit's function to train and improve that value so that the individual may worthily take his place in the life to come.

PART II.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE SPIRIT IN THE ANCIENT FATHERS

CHAPTER VI

THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT—WESTERN WRITERS

OF the power and influence of the Spirit upon the life of the individual, and in the life of the Church, there is no lack of teaching in the writings of the Eastern and Western Fathers. If only gradually they developed a doctrine of the Spirit's personality and divinity, and of His relation to the Father and Son, they had no hesitation in accepting from the beginning the teaching of the New Testament upon the Spirit's influence in human life. To go over their teaching upon the practical activity of the Spirit would be to do little more than to repeat what has already been gathered from the writers of the New Testament. The special contribution of the Fathers to the doctrine of the Spirit lies rather in the development of the doctrine of His personality, divinity and procession.* The development of these three aspects of the doctrine of

* " Procession " is the term used to define His relation to the Father and Son.

the Spirit took place during three epochs of the history of the early Church. In the second and third centuries the doctrine of the Spirit's personality was worked out. In the fourth century the doctrine of the divinity was established. In the fifth century the theory of the procession was developed.

In our own day, resort to the Holy Spirit as the source of spiritual grace and power is hindered mainly by the vagueness of our grasp of His personality. We are able to perceive the idea of the personality of the Father and that of the Son, but our conception of the distinct personality of the Spirit is much less clear. The difficulty is sometimes made worse by confusing the personality of the Spirit with that of the Son. Indeed, one solution of the problem of the Spirit's personality adopted by some writers is to identify Him with the Son.* The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Jesus. The operations of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic Church and in the Church of later days are the operations of the Risen Christ. According to this argument, there are two persons in the Godhead, and two only. But to take this short cut to a solution of the problem is to make a confession of failure, and it can only be maintained by ignoring the greater part of the New Testament teaching on the Spirit. At the same time it is to be observed that confusion between the Spirit and the Son is not a modern heresy, but dates back to the beginning of the history of Christian doctrine in the first and second centuries. Indeed, there are traces, although no more than traces, of the

* Prof. Pringle-Pattison in *The Spirit* (Streeter), pp. 11–12; Prof. Geo. Jackson in the *Hibbert Journal*, April 1926; Dr. W. S. Bishop, *Spirit and Personality*, Chapters I and II.

confusion in the New Testament. S. Paul writes: "God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts" (Gal. iv. 6), and in the Epistle to the Philippians he speaks of "the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ" in a context which refers to the operation of Christ in his body (Phil. i. 19). A similar equation of the Spirit of God with the Spirit of Christ appears in Romans viii. 9.*

While the great majority of New Testament passages clearly distinguish the personality of the Spirit from that of the Son, the same cannot be said of the patristic writers of the first two centuries. They were conscious of the Spirit's influence upon personal life, but they spoke of it as the influence rather of a power or attribute of the Godhead than of a person in God. This was partly due to special causes. It must be remembered that in the times which followed immediately upon the age of the apostles there was no canon of the New Testament as we possess it, gathered together and placed in the hands of all members of the Church. Apart from the fact that only a few could have read the books, even if they had been available, the teachers and thinkers of the Church had access only to portions of the New Testament. As time went on, and as the canon † developed, copyists were set to work, and each provincial Church strove to gain possession of a complete series of the books. Dr.

* "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 11. On the distinction between the Holy Spirit and the glorified Christ in the writings of S. Paul, cf. Dr. Gore, *Belief in Christ*, pp. 237 ff., 253 f., and *The Holy Spirit in the Church*, p. 113.

† The books which were regarded as inspired by the Holy Spirit. The list was only gradually compiled.

Streeter has recently shown that this accounts for the great variety of early versions of the texts of the New Testament,* and must have affected, we may conclude, the development of doctrine in different localities. But during the period which immediately followed the apostolic era, even this help was not available. Hence, from time to time, in the writings of that age there appears to be a decline from the teaching of the apostles as recorded in the books of the New Testament. To this fact must be partly attributed the vagueness of some early Sub-Apostolic writers on the doctrine of the Spirit.

There were other causes. Even to-day a close and prolonged study is required to gather together the teaching on the Spirit from the books of the New Testament. The busy preachers and administrators of Sub-Apostolic times had not always the leisure, even if the opportunity were provided by the possession of the books, and we may doubt whether they always possessed the necessary intellectual qualifications or the instinct for dogmatic teaching. Yet again, the Church soon became preoccupied with the larger problem of the divinity of Christ, and until that was settled, no special attention could be devoted to the elucidation of the doctrine of the Spirit.

At the same time, the fact that confusion between the persons of the Son and Spirit has continued to our own day,† indicates a fundamental difficulty in the problem which is quite independent of the special causes contributing to the difficulty experienced by

* *The Four Gospels*, pp. 35–45.

† Dr. W. S. Bishop makes an interesting, but not convincing, attempt to solve the problem in the first two chapters of his book, *Spirit and Personality*.

the early Christian writers. Our surprise arises not from the existence of the problem at that early date, but that no adequate attention has been paid to it by modern orthodox writers on the doctrine of the Spirit.

Hermas, in a book entitled *The Shepherd* (written A.D. 140–155), definitely identifies the personality of the Spirit with that of the Son: "I wish to explain to you what the Holy Spirit . . . shewed you, for that Spirit is the Son of God." * In an obscure passage Hermas describes the earthly existence of Jesus as an incarnation of the pre-existent Spirit, while the Son remained with the Godhead. On consultation with the Son, God took this incarnate Spirit up into the Godhead as partner with His own Spirit.† The confusion of thought is unmistakable. The functions of Son and Spirit in the Incarnation have been reversed, and the Spirit is described as being at the same time in the Godhead and incarnate upon earth. Harnack, the Berlin professor, points out that Hermas tried to distinguish between Jesus who was the "adopted" Son of God, and the Holy Spirit who was the "eternal" Son of God; but although this explanation goes some way to resolve the difficulty, it does not remove the confusion between the persons of the Spirit and the Son.

In a similar manner, the homily of an unknown writer of the Sub-Apostolic Age, formerly known as the Second Epistle of Clement ‡ to the Corinthians, speaks of the Spirit which is Christ, being incarnate in the Church. Indeed, the Sub-Apostolic writers

* *Sim.* ix. 1. 1. † *Ibid.* v. 5. 6 ff.

‡ Clement, Bishop of Rome, flourished *circa* A.D. 100. This homily is probably contemporary with the *Shepherd* of Hermas.

reflected the doctrine of the Ebionites, a sect of partly Christianised Jews, which prevailed among commentators on the New Testament in the early part of the second century A.D. According to the Ebionites,* Jesus was merely a man who was endowed at baptism with a special infusion of the Holy Spirit, which was withdrawn at the Passion, so that only the man Jesus suffered on the cross. Thus the divinity in Jesus was the Holy Spirit.

The influence of Ebionite teaching was felt by the apologetic writers of the second half of the first century.† Among the Greek writers of this school, Aristides described the Lord Jesus Christ as "Son of God most High," but as "having come down from heaven in the Holy Spirit for the salvation of men." ‡ Even Justin Martyr (*c.* 150) could not break away from the prevailing confusion of thought. "The Spirit and the Power which is from God must not be thought to be ought else but the Word § who is God's First Begotten." || But elsewhere Justin distinguished between the two persons. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch (180–192), showed a similar indecision of thought. He both confused and yet distinguished the Son and Spirit. When writing of prophecy, he identified the Spirit with the Son, "the Word being Spirit of God . . . came down on the prophets," ¶ but when speaking of creation, he distinguished the Spirit from the Son under the terms Word and Wisdom, who both operated upon Creation.**

* Jewish or Gnostic Christians.
† Known as the "Apologists."
‡ *Apology*, 15. § *Λόγος*. || *Apology*, i. 33.
¶ *Ad Autolytum*, ii. 10. ** *Ibid.* i. 7; ii. 10.

The distinction between the Son and Spirit begins to appear more clearly in the writings of Athenagoras. Writing (176–180) to the Emperors Aurelius and Commodus, he says, "The Son is in the Father and the Father is in the Son by the unity and power of the Spirit." But he does not go so far as to describe the Spirit as a person: "the Holy Spirit . . . we affirm to be an effluence of God," * and while ascribing divinity to the Father and Son he withholds it from the Spirit, "we held . . . the Father to be God and the Son God and Holy Spirit." He does not say "and the Holy Spirit *God*." Indeed, this passage suggests that he was upon the verge of describing the Spirit as an attribute of the Son; it might bear the interpretation, "The son who is *God and Holy Spirit*." He certainly speaks of the "Word or Son and the Holy Spirit" as one in power, and assigns to the Son the term "Wisdom," which is usually assigned to the Spirit.†

Harnack says that the Apologists were dependent "upon the formulæ of the Church's faith." ‡ But at that early date the Church had but few formulæ, and none concerning the Holy Spirit. As we have seen, she was influenced rather by the Ebionite writers; and soon fell under the influence of another widely influential school of thought, but with a different result. If Ebionite influences hindered the development of Christian doctrine, the Gnostics assisted it, partly by driving the orthodox writers to definition, and partly by the fact that, though expressing their

* Ἀπόρροια.

† *Leg.* 10, 24. Swete (*The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, pp. 41–5) estimates the teaching of Athenagoras too favourably.

‡ *History of Dogma*, ii. p. 209.

teaching in strange terms, they at least made personal distinctions within the Godhead.

We have no space to attempt to describe the details of the different systems of Gnosticism. They may be described as the Theosophists of the day, and may be divided into two main sections—Greek * and Oriental.† A common feature was the inclusion of Christian teaching within their systems, not as a common basis for their speculations, but as a means of interpreting the Greek and Oriental ideas of the relation between the seen and unseen worlds, which formed the basis of their systems. The speculations of the Gnostics were known to the Church from the days of Simon Magus onwards, and it is a point of interest that the subject in dispute between Simon Magus and St. Peter was the "gift" of the Holy Ghost.

One school of Gnostics of the Greek type, the Valentinians, conceived of the Spirit as a female principle or power.‡ The defence of the Church against the Valentinians was undertaken by Irenæus (120–200), Bishop of Lyons. "Through the Spirit," says Irenæus, "we mount up to the Son, and through the Son to the Father." § There is a Gnostic ring in

* Greek Gnosticism, based upon Platonic notions, worked out a system of divine emanations, or personal representations, not only of divine qualities and attributes, but also of divine functions.

† Oriental Gnosticism was based mainly upon the idea of the fundamental corruption of the flesh.

‡ The Apocryphal Gospel to the Hebrews refers to the Holy Spirit as the Mother of Jesus. This conception was a little later adopted by the Montanists. Montanus did something for the revival of preaching, and for belief in the Holy Spirit, but he taught that one of the two ladies who shared in his mission was an incarnation of the Holy Spirit.

§ *Hær.* v. 36; 2.

these words, which shows how powerfully the tone of Gnostic thought influenced the writers of the day. In a passage which recalls the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, he said, "Not without the Spirit can the Word of God be seen, and not without the Son can the Father be approached; the Father can only be known through the Son, and the Son only through the Holy Spirit." * Irenæus distinguished the Spirit rather by the conception of function than personality. He says that human nature was left by Christ to the Spirit, that through His influence we might bear fruit.† "The Spirit operates, the Son administers, the Father approves." ‡ He approached a clearer distinction between the persons in the statement, "The Word was always with the Father . . . that Wisdom also, which is the Spirit, was with Him before all creation." §

But Irenæus failed to break away entirely from the hesitation, and, perhaps, from the confusion between the persons of Son and Spirit characteristic of earlier writers. "He had a ministry which was abundant and beyond words, for He is ministered to in all things by His own offering and His image, *i.e.* by the Son and Holy Spirit." ‖ In this passage the term "Holy Spirit" is used impersonally, and the designation image is a term applied in the New Testament to the Son.¶

Harnack, commenting on the statement of Irenæus that the Father anoints, the Son is anointed, and the Holy Spirit is the oil,** perhaps unfairly sums up his teaching with the remark that "no doubt that Irenæus

* *Preaching*, c. 7.
† *Hær.* iii. 17; 3.
‡ *Ibid.* v. 20; 6.
§ *Ibid.* iv. 20; 3, 4.
‖ *Ibid.* iv. 7; 4.
¶ Heb. i. 3.
** *Hær.* iii. 18; 3.

firmly believes in the distinction of the Spirit from the Father and the Son, and in a particular significance belonging to the Spirit," but continues, "the personality of the Spirit vanishes with Him." * It would be more fair to say that the personality of the Spirit occupied a place in the belief of Irenæus, but that it is not clearly and certainly stated in his teaching.†

Even when meeting the attacks of the originators of Unitarian teaching at the beginning of the third century the orthodox writers did not break away from the impersonal conception of the earlier period. Indeed, while on the whole the Unitarianism of their adversaries assisted the Church to define more clearly the Spirit's divinity, yet its influence hindered the orthodox writers from developing clearly the conception of His personality. Attempts to define the persons of the Son and the Spirit within the Godhead created a reaction in the minds of some who thought that the Unity of God was threatened. From the Greek word meaning unity,‡ these teachers were called Monarchians. They, like the Gnostics, consisted mainly of two schools. The chief representative of one school was Paul of Samosata. According to him, Jesus was indwelled by the impersonal Word or Wisdom of God, and he denied the existence of a personal Son or Spirit in the Godhead. This was really a revival of Ebionism. The Holy Spirit was generally ignored by this section of Dynamic or Rationalistic Monarchians, although Paul of Samosata

* *History of Dogma*, ii. p. 266.

† Dr. Gore, *The Holy Spirit in the Church*, p. 212, notes ambiguity in the early writers, including Irenæus.

‡ ἡ μοναρχία.

defined Him as a divine property or faculty or influence. The other school, the Modal Monarchians, also concerned itself mainly with the Son, and disregarded the Spirit, although its chief representative, Sabellius of Rome, found it necessary to include the Holy Spirit in his system. According to Sabellius, the Godhead was one essence.* In his earlier teaching, he invented the term "Son-Father" † to describe this unity, and when his system was finally worked out, he taught that the Father, Son, and Spirit were three modes or aspects of the one divine Being or essence, equivalent to the body, soul, and spirit of a man. The Sabellians were charged by the Eastern Church with teaching that the Father suffered on the cross.‡ But this was rather an unfair conclusion drawn from the teaching of Sabellius. Sabellius taught that the Godhead suffered on the cross in the aspect or mode of the Son.

The orthodox writers protested against the obliteration of personal distinctions within the Godhead, yet so strong were Unitarian tendencies in the theological thought of the day, that in the West they were not able to break away entirely from Monarchian conceptions or even Monarchian terminology.§ Hippolytus (*c.* 160–236), while clearly showing his belief in the personality of the Son, yet fell back into the uncertainty of the Sub-Apostolic writers in his teaching on the

* *ὑπόστασις.* Sabellius used this term in its earlier or Alexandrian significance, which was equivalent to *οὐσία*; not in its later or Antiochene sense, which was almost equivalent to *πρόσωπον.* The different use of this term was the rock on which Cyril and Nestorius split.

† *υἱοπάτωρ.*

‡ So they were Patripassians.

§ The description of the Godhead as an "economy" is a Monarchian term used by both Hippolytus and Tertullian.

Spirit, "I will not speak of two Gods, but of one only; yet I will speak of two persons, and, third in the order of economy, the grace of the Holy Spirit. For the Father is one, but there are two persons, since there is also the Son; and the third, the Holy Spirit." * Thus the Holy Spirit is not personal, He is spoken of impersonally as "Grace."

Even more remarkable was the influence of Monarchianism on the orthodox writer Tertullian.† In his writings against the Monarchians, whilst striving to maintain personal distinctions within the Godhead, he could not withstand the tendency of contemporary thought to lay greater stress upon the unity of God. "A trinity which proceeds from the Father by closely connected relations is not in conflict with the unity." ‡ He does not apply the term person to Father, Son, and Spirit. The Spirit is merely a "third name of the Godhead and a third relation of divine majesty." § Sometimes his language is reminiscent of one section of the Monarchians; he says the Godhead is not "three in condition," but in "mode of existence." ||

The Western Church in the first three centuries failed to arrive at any clear conception of the Spirit's personality in relation to the Father and the Son, and, as we shall see, this remained a defect in Western theology throughout the age of the Fathers. On the other hand, by the middle of the third century the Western writers had been able to distinguish his

* *Adv. Noet.* 14.

† An African writer who died in A.D. 210. Earlier in life he came under the influence of the Montanists, and defended them. Their evangelistic ardour encouraged the persecuted Churches of South Gaul, Spain, and North Africa.

‡ *Adv. Praxeam*, 8.

§ *Ibid.* 30.

|| *Ibid.* 2.

personality in relation to His mission to the Church. Their teaching may be summed up by the statement of Novatian: "Both logical order and the authority of the Creed warn us that our belief in the Son must be followed by belief in the Holy Spirit . . . the Spirit promised in the Gospel is not a new Spirit, nor even newly given . . . one and the same Spirit dwelt in the prophets and the apostles," * and he goes on to describe the practical influence of the Spirit upon individuals in the Church. Like the writers of the New Testament, the Western Fathers of the first three centuries were content rather to recognise the Spirit's influence on the Church, than to attempt to define His status in the Godhead.†

* *De Trin.* 16 (29).

† Cf. *infra*, pp. 89–90, 105 ff., for the Western writers of the fourth century.

CHAPTER VII

THE PERSONALITY OF THE SPIRIT—EASTERN WRITERS

WHILE the Western Church was struggling to develop incipient Trinitarian conceptions, a school of theologians appeared at Alexandria who laid the groundwork of Trinitarian doctrine on a foundation from which it was never afterwards shaken. This result was achieved not merely by developing orthodox doctrine in the face of heretical attack, but by incorporating certain ideas from an ancient body of Greek thought. Through Plotinus, the Christian Neo-Platonists of Alexandria introduced Platonist conceptions into the interpretation of Christian doctrine.* According to the Neo-Platonic system, all forms of life or being or existence are connected, from the highest to the lowest, and represent a regular series of diminishing value or significance, with God at the head and inanimate nature at the end of the series. The value of this theory as an aid to the interpretation of Christian doctrine will be seen at once.† It assisted

* The Christian Platonists wove Platonism into the fabric of Christian doctrine, and produced the School of Clement and Origen. The Greek Gnostics wove Christian tradition into the fabric of Platonism and produced the extravagances of Valentinus and Basilides.

† Cf. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria* (2nd ed.), pp. 236–241.

in making clear the distinctions within the Godhead, and established the personality of the third Being of the Godhead. But it was not equally successful in demonstrating the equality of the divine persons. As the scale of being in the Neo-Platonic system was one of diminishing status or value, there was a tendency among the Christian Neo-Platonists to subordinate the Son to the Father, and the Spirit to the Son.

Quoting Plato in the *Timaeus*, Clement of Alexandria (died 202) says, "Around the King of all, all things are, and because of Him are all things, and He is the cause of all good things; and around the second are things second in order; and around the third, the third." Clement continues, "I understand nothing else than the Holy Trinity to be meant; for the third is the Holy Spirit, and the Son is the second, by whom all things were made according to the will of the Father." * The distinction of the Holy Spirit from the Father and Son is here maintained, although the Platonic illustration might imply inferiority of condition, and does not necessarily imply personality.

But all hesitation disappears in the teaching of Origen (*c.* 185–254). This great Alexandrian, who may be regarded as the most learned as well as the most voluminous writer of the ancient Church, was led, under the influence of Neo-Platonic conceptions, to a more explicit statement of the Spirit's personality. To whatever extent the same influence may have caused him to subordinate the status of the Spirit to that of the Son, there can be no doubt that a doctrine

* *Strom.* v. 14. Justin Martyr had alluded to the Platonic conception, though without pressing it so far as Clement (Justin, *Apol.* i. 60).

of the Spirit's separate personality was distinctly developed by him. In the midst of a discussion on the nature of the Spirit, he says: "A third course indeed is open to you—to deny that the Holy Spirit has any personal existence other than that of the Father and the Son," but this, says Origen, is the method adopted by the Monarchians for escaping from the difficulty. "We being convinced that there are three persons * in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, . . . I conceive then of the Holy Spirit as supplying the material, so to speak, of the gifts of grace that come from God; this material is wrought from God, ministered by Christ, and exists personally in the Holy Spirit." †

The contrast between the Monarchian teaching on the Spirit as an energy or power of God, and the personal status attributed to him by Origen is brought out in Origen's comment on S. John iii. 8. He says, "This shows that the Spirit is an essence. He is not, as some suppose, a divine energy, having, as they contend, no distinctive personal existence." ‡

We shall see later that to Origen must be attributed the source of some of the teaching of Arius, but from the same source the orthodox Cappadocian writers of the fourth century derived some of their fundamental ideas. Origen's attack upon the Monarchians was doubtless called forth by the spread of Unitarian (Sabellian) teaching in Egypt. At the same time, the tritheistic tendency of his defence soon made itself apparent. It lay behind the dispute which arose between

* Hypostases.

† *In Ev. Joan.* ii. 10.

‡ *Ibid.* iii. 8, "Essence" refers to His divine nature and being.

Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria (247), a pupil of Origen's, on the one hand, and Sixtus II of Rome (257–259) and Dionysius, Bishop of Rome (259–269), on the other,* a dispute in which Dionysius of Rome wrongly charged the Church of Alexandria with teaching Tritheism.†

In the next chapter we shall see the orthodox theologians winning the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity from the hands of the Arians during the fourth century. But the Arian controversy played its part in conserving the Church's faith in the personality of the Spirit; even the followers of Arius did not deny a separate and a personal existence to Him. The second creed of the Arian Council of Antioch (341) stated that "the Holy Spirit is really Holy Spirit, the names of the persons being not careless, but accurate terms, intimating the proper personality, rank and glory of each person." This was followed by clear statements, in the third and fourth Antiochene creeds, of the personal mission of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic Church.

On the orthodox side, the development of the belief in the personality of the Spirit was continued by the principal writers. Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, who played a leading part among the orthodox Bishops

* But Swete points out (*The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 138) that the dispute between the two Bishops was influenced by different interpretations given to the word "hypostasis." To Dionysius of Rome, hypostasis meant "ousia," or essence, or Godhead; while to Dionysius of Alexandria it meant a person. This was, of course, one of the causes of the dispute between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius (cf. Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and His Teaching*), but it is not clear that at this date the use of "hypostasis" as equivalent to "person" was in use at Alexandria (cf. Bethune-Baker, *History of Early Christian Doctrine*, pp. 236–237), and certainly the fact that Cyril so vehemently supported the older use of the term, as an equivalent for "ousia," confirms this opinion.

† "Fragment," 37.

at Nicæa (325), but who afterwards became suspected of Semiarian tendencies, stated that he believed "each of those persons to be and subsist, the Father truly Father, the Son truly Son, and the Holy Spirit truly Holy Spirit." So also, Cyril of Jerusalem (*c.* 315–386) who, like Eusebius, was suspected of Semiarian leanings, devoted much space to describing the Spirit's personal activity.* He says, "It is established that there are various appellations, but one and the same Spirit—the Holy Spirit, living and personally subsisting, and always present together with the Father and the Son; not as being spoken or breathed forth from the mouth and lips of the Father and Son, or diffused into the air; but as a personally existing being, Himself speaking and operating and exercising His dispensation and hallowing.† "We need the grace of the Holy Spirit to treat aright of His person and work." ‡ "To define accurately the personality of the Holy Spirit is impossible; we must be content to guard against errors on various sides." § . . . "The Holy Spirit is not like the wind or the breath, an impersonal force, but one that lives and speaks. He is not like the unclean spirits, a hostile force, but one that makes wholly for our good." ‖ . . . "It is enough for us to know these things: be not curious as to the Spirit's nature or personality." ¶ This language finally breaks away from the Old Testament conception of the Spirit as the "ruah" or breath of God.

To the great champion of the Nicene faith,

* *Catechetical Lectures*, xvi., xvii.
† *Ibid.* xvii. 5.
‡ *Ibid.* xvi. 1, 2.
§ *Ibid.* xvi. 11, 12.
‖ *Ibid.* xvi. 16.
¶ *Ibid.* xvi. 24.

Athanasius (*c.* 295–373), we owe almost as much for the defence of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as for the defence of the doctrine of the Son. But the main work of Athanasius was concerned with the statement and elaboration of the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity. Harnack contends that "the personality of the Spirit is simply presupposed by Athanasius in the indefinite form in which he also presupposed the personality of the Son."* But if he devotes but little attention to the doctrine of the Spirit's personality, that was because divinity, not personality, was now under discussion. So also Didymus (*c.* 330–400) of Alexandria, and Epiphanius of Salamis,† pay little attention to the question of the Spirit's personality. By the middle of the fourth century, the doctrine of the Spirit's personality was widely accepted. Even the Arians admitted it.

If the Arian controversy inaugurated the Creed-making era in Church history, it was instrumental also in causing the orthodox theologians to expand the terminology of the Creed into theological disquisition. The great literature which deals with the personality and divinity of the Son and the Spirit sprang from that controversy, and represents the matured thought of the orthodox Fathers, when, leaving behind the heat and excitement of the Council-hall, they returned to the study in order to give a rational interpretation of the formulæ of the creeds.

A school of writers appeared in the bishoprics of

* *History of Dogma*, iv. p. 112. Cf. T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, pp. 149–150. Mr. Rees thinks that Athanasius confused the personality of the Spirit with that of the Son.

† Epiphanius became Bishop of Salamis in 367.

Cappadocia which for the first time separated the doctrine of the Spirit from that of Logos, and created a literature of the Spirit. They were under the influence of Origen in his more orthodox mood, but they broke away from the mere repetition of traditional arguments. They succeeded in introducing new ideas, such as Gregory of Nyssa's theory of the "mediate" derivation of the Spirit through the Son, which became the fundamental notion of the Eastern interpretation of the procession doctrine. They also introduced a variety of new illustrations characterised by a freshness and aptness not usually associated with the work of orthodox writers, and treated in a philosophical manner which precludes any lengthy description in this sketch.

In his book *De Spiritu Sancto* (written 374–375), Basil, the Bishop of Cappadocian Cæsarea, says that the personality of the Spirit is clearly taught in Scripture, and he collects and discusses the titles given to the Spirit in Scripture, together with the functions assigned to Him, as evidence of His personality.* The Holy Spirit is "one," and we speak of Him singly. The special indication of the Spirit's individuality † is that He is an intelligent Essence of unlimited power, magnitude and duration—a power manifold in its potencies.‡ A great part of Basil's work, like that of the other two Cappadocian writers, is occupied with the old Trinitarian–Unitarian controversy,§ and is useful rather for the development of Trinitarian doctrine than the doctrine of the Spirit.

Contemporary with the work of Basil was that of

* *De Spiritu Sancto*, ix. † ἰδιότητος. ‡ *De Sp. S.*, ix.
§ *De Spiritu Sancto*, xviii., xxv., xxvi.

his brother Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa (372–395). Like Basil, he had come under the influence of Origen's teaching, but he throws his emphasis into the scale against Tritheism.* He combines the conception of Cyril of Jerusalem with that of the Old Testament, "And as the Word of God has personal existence, so the breath of God, which goes forth from the Word, must be held to be a living power which has a personality of its own." The Spirit is an essential power existing in its own proper person.† His existence is peculiar to Himself. He is not unoriginated like the Father, nor Only Begotten like the Son, but like Father and Son He is uncreated.‡

The third of the great Cappadocian doctors was Gregory of Nazianzus (300–390), Bishop of Sasima. After the death of his friend Basil (399), he became the head of the orthodox leaders at Constantinople. In a sermon preached in the Church of Resurrection, Gregory said that the Holy Ghost must either have a separate existence of His own, distinct from that of Father and Son, or else a temporary existence to fulfil a special purpose. In the latter case the Spirit is simply a divine activity operated solely by God, which was, of course, the view of the dynamic Monarchians of the school of Paul of Samosata. But the Scripture speaks of the Spirit as capable of the actions and emotions of a person.§ The distinction of the three persons is indicated by the fact that they are unbegotten, or begotten, or proceeding.‖ There is no difference of grade between Son and Spirit. They are two co-equal persons.¶ Some

* Quod sint tres dii. † *Orat. Catech.* ii. ‡ *Contra Eun.* i. 22.
§ *Theol. Oratio*, v. 7. ‖ *Ibid.* v. 9. ¶ *Ibid.* v. 14.

things the persons have in common as God, and some things there are which belong to one person, but not to another.*

As a school of theologians, the Cappadocian Fathers stood mid-way between the later Alexandrians † on the one hand and the Antiochenes on the other. If Cyril and his followers at Alexandria stressed the Unity of the Godhead, the Antiochenes laid chief emphasis upon the distinctions within the Godhead. The theology, and especially the pneumatology of the Cappadocians, combined the two attitudes in a well-constructed scheme, which preserved the Unity while maintaining the persons. This was their chief service to the development of doctrine. If anything had been lacking in the teaching of the Cappadocian Fathers, so that the doctrine of the Spirit's personality remained in doubt, that gap would have been filled, and that doubt removed, by the writers of the Antiochene school. Theodore, Bishop of Mopsuestia (392–428) wrote, "There is a proper person of the Father, a proper person of the Son, and a proper person of the Holy Spirit, each alike belonging to the divine essence." ‡ . . . "We worship Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, holding that the divine, eternal and uncreated Trinity finds its full complement in three persons." § Theodore was one of the few early writers to admit what most must have perceived, namely, that the doctrine of the Spirit's personality has no place in the Old Testament. "The men of the Old Testament knew nothing of the Holy Spirit as a

* *Theol. Oratio*, xxv.

† The later Alexandrians, to be distinguished from the earlier Christian Neo-Platonists.

‡ *Com. in Haggai.*

§ *Ad Artemium.*

hypostasis existing in His own person with God. This was first taught by the Lord Christ, when He sent the apostles to baptise in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the Old Testament shows no knowledge of a distinct person or hypostasis of the Spirit; * it gave the name 'Holy Spirit' or 'Spirit of God' to the grace of the Spirit, or to the divine oversight, care or interest, or something of this kind." Equally clearly does the much-misunderstood theologian Nestorius state the Spirit's personality. "The Godhead is one and the persons are three." † . . . "The Spirit exists in His own proper person, and as such He can be a separate object of thought, inasmuch as He is Spirit and not Son." It is a separate object of thought and worship and generation that the doctrine of the Spirit's personality emphasises.‡ In these words Nestorius directs attention to what is perhaps the chief requisite in the Church's life and worship to-day—to realise the Spirit's person, to worship Him as a person, and to apply to Him as a person for grace and strength for the common work of life. As John of Damascus wrote in the eighth century, the Spirit is "personal, § existing in a personality which is His own."

To the Greek or Eastern Church belongs the merit of working out the doctrine of the personality of the Spirit. In the West, from time to time, the subject appears in the writings of the Latin Fathers of the fourth century, although usually in the form of a passing reference in some general discussion on the

* *Com. in Haggai.*
† Bethune-Baker, *Nestorius and His Teaching*, p. 167.
‡ Migne, *P.G.* lxxvii. 117. § ἐνυπόστατος.

Trinity; thus Ambrose (Bp. 374–97), the first great Western Father to write an extensive work on the Holy Spirit, contributes nothing definite to the doctrine of personality. The attitude of the West is reflected in the complaint of Augustine (354–430), who said that there had been no thorough discussion of the distinct personality of the Holy Spirit by scholars and expositors of Holy Scripture.* This may have been true of the Western Church, but it was not a charge which could fairly be brought against the Eastern Church after the writing of the Cappadocian Fathers had been published. At the same time, none of the Western Fathers after the time of Damasus (366–384) failed to accept the teaching of the Spirit's personality, but their work comes more properly under review when we approach the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity and procession. It was perhaps not unnatural that the Eastern thinkers, who were the leading critics of Western Monarchianism or Unitarianism, should have supplied the most detailed teaching on the Spirit's person, and that, on the other hand, the Western writers, who were always more under the influence of Monarchian conceptions, should have set their pneumatology in a Trinitarian setting. The Trinitarian doctrine was in reality the Church's definition of the Unity of God. The fact that the consciousness of the Spirit's personality within the Church has been in some measure lost, indicates a certain deficiency in the Trinitarian doctrine, and of Western teaching generally, as an exposition of the distinctions within the Godhead. That deficiency is, however, supplied in the Eastern development of the doctrine of the Spirit's personality.

* *De Fide et Symbolo.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT—BEGINNING AND COURSE OF THE ARIAN DISPUTE

IT does not follow that if the Spirit has personal existence He is therefore God. He may be no more than a heavenly being, a sort of super-archangel. This was the conception adopted by the Arians in the middle of the fourth century, and for a long period the statements of the Church hesitated upon this fundamental matter. It may be that the orthodox writers hesitated rather in the sphere of definition than of belief. The New Testament does not actually call the Holy Spirit "God," and even the framers of the Creed of Constantinople (381) are satisfied with the appellation "Lord." Yet gradually the orthodox doctors were driven to state in express terms the implications of the New Testament teaching, and gradually the statement of the divinity of the Spirit was developed. The point is of fundamental importance, both in relation to our Lord's teaching that the life and work of the Church would be under the supervision of the Spirit, and still more if there is to be a revival of the Church's belief in the Spirit, and resort to Him as the inspiration and guide of the personal life of her members.

The development of the belief in the divinity of the Spirit is wrapped up with the development of Trinitarian doctrine. The object of that teaching was to direct attention to the fact that both Son and Spirit shared in the one Godhead. Traces of Trinitarian doctrine date back to early Sub-Apostolic times, although of course it is not expressed in formal terms.*

The Sub-Apostolic writers, like the New Testament writers, and indeed like the early Apologists, are more concerned with the Spirit's work in the Old Testament prophets,† in the Church, and the individual,‡ than with His divinity. In these connections they accord to Him divine functions, in language which closely resembles that of the New Testament.

But in the writings of the Greek Apologists of the second century we come upon that uncertainty about the Spirit's rank and status which ended in the Arian subordination of His personality to that of the Son. This was a natural consequence of their hesitation concerning His separate personality. Justin Martyr writes, " We adore and worship Him (the Father), and with Him the Son who came from Him and taught us these things, and the host of the other good angels who follow Him and are made like Him, and the Spirit of Prophecy." § It will be observed that Justin here interposes the angels between the Son and the Spirit. Harnack is not certain that the passage is genuine, and he points out that " the placing of the Spirit after the angels does not necessarily imply a position inferior

* *Pseudo-Clem.*, 1 Cor. lviii. 2; Ignatius, *Epis. ad Magn.* xiii. 1; *Martyr. Polyc.* xiv. 1; *Didache*, vii. 1.

† *Pseudo-Clem.*, *Epis. of Barn.*

‡ Ignatius, *Epis. of Barn.*, *Didache*, Hermas, *Pseudo-Clem.*

§ *Apol.* i. 6.

to theirs, but merely a subordination to the Father and the Son common to the Spirit and angels." * Moreover, in other passages Justin gives the Spirit precedence over the angels. But that he attributed at least inferiority of rank to the Spirit, and indeed to the Son, in relation to the Father, is confirmed by two other passages. He says the Son has " the second place," and he assigns " a third rank to the Spirit of prophecy," † and supports his teaching by an appeal to Plato, who, he says, " gives the second place to the Logos which is with God . . . and the third place to the Spirit." ‡ But while he assigns inferior rank to the Spirit, we have no means of deciding whether Justin attributed inferiority of nature and essence to Him. A similar subordination of the Spirit's rank appears in Tatian, who speaks of the Spirit as God's " Ambassador," or " Deputy," or " Minister." §

The teaching of Athenagoras is less vague. We have seen that Athenagoras distinguishes the Spirit's identity from that of Father and Son, although he does not actually attribute to Him personality. But he places the Spirit in the same category with the Father and Son in speaking of their relations within the Godhead. What we desire to know, he says, is " the true God and the Word that is from Him ; what is the Unity of the Son to the Father, what the fellowship of the Father to the Son, what is the Spirit ; what is the unity of these mighty powers, and the distinction that exists between them, united as they are—the Spirit, the Son, the Father ? " || Elsewhere

* *Hist. of Dog.* ii. p. 209.
† *Apol.* i. 13.
‡ *Ibid.* i. 60.
§ *Or. adv. Graec.*
|| *Leg.* 12.

Athenagoras shrinks from calling the Spirit "God."* But in this passage he attributes to the Spirit at least a definite sphere in the being of God.

Theophilus was the first Greek writer to use a term which means Trinity,† yet the significance given by Him to the term is doubtful, for while speaking of the Word and Wisdom (or Spirit) of God as forming a trinity with God, he adds man as a fourth term to the series, and so turns his trinity into a quaternity.‡ Perhaps we are to see here the influence of Neo-Platonic conceptions, and if so, his teaching may imply the subordination of the Spirit to the Son, which is characteristic of other Greek Apologists. Yet if the Apologists shrank from definitely speaking of the Spirit as divine, on the other hand, they did not, like the Arians, describe Him as a creature. The theology of the Church had not yet systematically undertaken the task of investigating the Spirit's nature and being.

Irenæus was compelled by Gnostic speculation to present a more extensive account of the Christian system than any which had yet been attempted. Without supplying any theory of the relation between the persons within the being of God, he definitely places the Holy Spirit in the Godhead and so sets Him up over against the created world. His confutation of the Gnostic theory of emanations led him thus far. "There is, therefore, one God, who made and constructed all things by His Word and Wisdom."§ . . . "By His own Word and Spirit He makes, orders and

* *Leg.* 10. † *τριάς.*

‡ *τετρακτύς.* But he confused the persons of Son and Spirit. Cf. *supra*, p. 72.

§ *Hær.* iv. 20. 3, 4.

governs all things, and gives them all their being." * To the Spirit as well as the Son the angels are subject, "For His offspring and His similitude † do minister to Him (the Father) in every respect; that is the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Word and Wisdom; whom all the angels serve and to whom they are subject." ‡ The Spirit shared in the work of creation: "For with Him were always present the Word and the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, He made all things, in whom also He speaks, saying, 'Let us make man in our own image.'" § There may be traces of the subordination of the Son and the Spirit, a suggestion of inferiority of rank in relation to the Father, in these statements, but the deity of the Spirit, even though regarded as an attribute of God, begins to appear in the teaching of Irenæus.

Yet the statements of Theophilus and Irenæus on the Spirit's divinity must be read in the light of their uncertain teaching on His personality. Hence the way was clear for the influence of Unitarian doctrine upon the Church's dogmatic system. While the apprehension of distinct personality was obscure, and while the functions of Son and Spirit might be interchangeable, the terms Son and Spirit might imply no more than different aspects or modes of God. Perhaps, among the Apologists, Athenagoras gives the least uncertain teaching on the divinity of the Spirit. The reaction against Gnostic teaching carried some of the ecclesiastical writers too far in the other direction, and in the Unitarian teaching of the different

* *Preaching*, c. 5.
‡ *Hær.* iv. 7. 4.
† *Figuratio.*
§ *Ibid.* iv. 20. 1.

Monarchian schools, the Spirit's separate identity, together with that of the Son, was merged in the Unity of God. On the other hand, although the Monarchians denied personality to the Spirit, their teaching emphasised His divinity. All the personal functions attributed by the orthodox writers to the Spirit, were assigned by the Monarchians to the one divine Being, and were interpreted either as manifestations of divine power, or revelations of divine attributes. Tertullian was the first orthodox writer to attempt a reasoned explanation of the relations existing within the Trinity, and he was the first Latin writer to make use of the term. He spoke of the Spirit as "the third name of Godhead," * and for the first time in his writings the term "Deus" is applied to the Spirit.† On the other hand, the mind of the Church was still uncertain. Novatian, for example, writes hesitatingly of the Spirit's divinity,‡ and the seeds of the Arian heresy were sown by the Christian Platonists of Alexandria. While Clement confined his attention mainly to an account of the Spirit's work within the Church, the problem of His divinity was treated at length by Origen. But there are two phases in his teaching. On the one hand, Origen said that the Holy Spirit is "associated in honour and dignity with the Father and Son. § . . . In the Trinity nothing can be said to be greater or less." ‖ ". . . From the Scriptures we learn that the Holy Spirit is of such authority and dignity that saving Baptism is not possible unless in the Trinity. In the

* *Adv. Prax.* 30.
† *Ibid.* 13.
‡ Cf. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 107.
§ *De Princ.* i. præf. 4.
‖ *De Princ.* i. 3, 7.

forms of Baptism the Holy Spirit is named with the Unbeggotten Father, and the Only-Begotten Son. No Scripture speaks of Him as a creature.* Who is not amazed at the majesty of the Holy Spirit in relation to the unpardonable sin? So awful is the majesty of the Spirit that he who blasphemes Him has no forgiveness either in this world or in the world to come." †

But in one of his earlier writings, Origen speaks of Him in terms which seem to assign to Him an inferior rank within the Godhead. "We have to ask ourselves whether the Holy Spirit was made by the Word. I think that if you say the Holy Spirit is made,‡ and admit that all things were made by the Word, you must perforce accept the inference that the Holy Spirit was made by the Word, and that the Word is the elder of the two. The alternative is to call the Spirit 'ingenerate.' § We being convinced that there are three persons in God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and believing that nothing is ingenerate except the Father, must admit as more reverent and as true the answer which places the Holy Spirit in the category of things made by the Father through the Son, although in honour He is above them all." ‖ This language develops the hesitating statements of the second century Apologists into open heresy.

Even in a later section of the same *Commentary on S. John*, in which he teaches that the Son and the Spirit are to receive equal honour, and are equally far above creation, Origen subordinates both to the

* ποημα, κτίσμα.
‡ γενητόν.
‖ *In Ev. Joan.* ii. 10.
† *De Princ.* i. 3.
§ ἀγεννητόν

Father. This teaching is one of the sources of the later Arian doctrine. Yet when he speaks of the Son and Spirit as being "generate" or "originate" he does not mean created. He states definitely that "no scripture speaks of Him as a creature."

The effect of Origen's teaching began to appear in the dispute which broke out in Egypt soon after the middle of the third century, and which called forth the correspondence between Dionysius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria; and in the Arian controversy which began with the teachings of Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, in the second decade of the fourth century.

This dispute was primarily concerned with the divinity of the Son, but shortly before 360 the doctrine of the Spirit became openly involved in the controversy, and it was in Egypt, again, that the trouble arose. Athanasius, the great champion of orthodoxy, was in exile in the Nitrian Desert or in the Thebaid. Serapion, Bishop of Thmuis, in the Egyptian Delta, wrote to him saying that the Arians in the neighbourhood had now accepted the Godhead of the Son, but were teaching that the Holy Spirit was not divine, and that He was a creature, one of the ministering angels, who differed from them only in degree.* At the Synod of Alexandria (362), attended by Athanasius, the first formal discussion on the Spirit's divinity took place. It was declared that the Holy Spirit is "not a creature nor foreign to the divine nature, but belongs to it and is indivisible from the essence of the Son and the Father," and the Council anathematised "those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature and separate from the essential

* Athanasius, *Ep. ad Serap.* i.

nature of Christ, for those who, while they pretend to hold the Nicene faith, venture to blaspheme the Holy Spirit, are Arians at heart, though they may profess to reject that heresy." *

Meanwhile, the new heresy had broken out at Constantinople in 360. The Semiarian Eustathius, Bishop of Sebaste, said, " I neither choose to name the Holy Spirit God, nor should I venture to call Him a creature." † Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, said, " He had no claim to divine honours which were attributed to the Son, being but a minister and a servant as the holy angels may without offence be called." ‡ The teaching of Macedonius spread throughout the East, and gained an entrance in the West, especially after he was able to persuade Liberius, the Bishop of Rome (352–356), that he accepted the original Nicene statement, " in the Holy Spirit."

We are not concerned with the details of the controversy which lengthened the Arian dispute by twenty years. Perhaps the widest gulf between the Arian teaching and that of the Church was reached when Eunomius claimed that the Spirit was " the first and greatest of the works of the Son," § so that he was third in nature as well as order.‖ The controversy was brought to an end in the West by the influence of the Emperors Valentinian, Valens and Gratian (364–375) in the Synods of Rome and Gaul.¶ So also in the East the intervention of Theodocius the Great assisted the Council of Constantinople in 381 to declare its belief in the divinity of the Spirit. The Creed of Nicaea

* Athanasius, *Tom. ad Antioch.* 3.
‡ Sozomen, *H.E.* iv. 27.
‖ *Ibid.* xxix. 661.
† Socrates, *H.E.* ii. 45.
§ Migne, *P.G.* xxx. 868.
¶ Theodoret, *H.E.* iv. 7.

was reaffirmed, and probably the additional words concerning the Spirit, which appear in our version of the Nicean Creed, were then added. In this statement the Spirit is not declared to be of the same essence as the Father and Son, but His divine nature is declared explicitly in the terms "Lord and Lifegiver," and implicitly in the co-adoration and conglorification with the Father and Son which are assigned to Him. These statements were confirmed at Constantinople in 382, and again in 383, and the Arian opposition collapsed in the East. Their teaching survived on the Danube, in Lombardy and in Spain, but finally yielded to the orthodox doctrine.

CHAPTER IX

THE THEOLOGICAL WRITERS OF THE FOURTH CENTURY

THE history of the controversy illustrates the need which existed for careful inquiry into the doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The uncertainty existing in the mind of the Church is illustrated by the attitude of Eusebius of Cæsarea, who produced the Creed of Cæsarea at the Council of Nicæa. In replying to the teaching of Marcellus of Ancyra, he said, "The Paraclete cannot be called either 'God' or 'Son,' since He has not received His origin directly from the Father as the Son did, but is one of the things that were made by the Son."* Yet Eusebius does not venture to speak of the Holy Spirit as a creature in the human sense. He lived and wrote before the implications of the teaching of Arius were realised by the Church.

Not till towards the end of the sixth decade of the fourth century did the doctrine of the divinity, as distinct from the doctrine of the personality, of the Holy Spirit receive adequate treatment. From the beginning of the dispute Athanasius had perceived and warned the Church that the Holy Spirit was involved in the Arian teaching, and in the *Orations against the Arians* and *Letters to Serapion* he fore-

* *De Eccles. Theol.* iii.

stalled the Arian attack on the Spirit, which did not break out until after 360. Athanasius wrote, "It is because of the grace of the Holy Spirit which is in us that we come to be in Him, and He in us; and since the Spirit is the Spirit of God, possessing Him we are accounted to be in God, and so God is in us." * "... How can they permit it to be received that the Spirit was created by the Son? If on account of the unity of the Word with the Father, they do not allow that the Son came from a created being, how can they hold that the Spirit, who is united to the Son, as the Son to the Father, is a created being? Why do they ignore the fact that by maintaining the unity of the Father and the Son they preserve the Trinity, and so by severing the Holy Spirit they break up the Trinity, giving Him a different nature, and mingling Him with things created? This clearly proves the Trinity to be no longer one, but composed of diverse natures, on account of the different substance of the Spirit." † "... The Lord founded the faith of the Catholic Church on the Trinity, and He could not have classed the Holy Spirit with the Father and Son, had the Spirit been a creature. The Trinity, if it be a fact in the divine life, must be an eternal fact. If, therefore, the Trinity is eternal, the Spirit is not a creature, because He is in the Word. If He is a creature, then there *was* when the Trinity *was not*, but was a duality. They say that the Trinity came about by change and progress, that there was a duality which waited for the production of a creature, in order that it might be ranked with the Father and Son, and so form a Trinity." ‡ "... The

* *Or. c. Arian.* iii. 24.
† *Ad Serap.* i. 2; cf. i. 17 and 28. ‡ *Ibid.* iii. 7.

Holy Spirit is not a creature, but is united to the Son as the Son to the Father, confessed with the Word, working what the Father through the Son works." * He is "of the very essence of the Word, and of the very essence of God, and so is said to be in Him." † ". . . Let us think of the Holy Spirit as we think of the Father and the Son; for as we believe in God the Father and in His Only-Begotten Son, so we believe also in the Holy Spirit." ‡

The defence of the doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit was continued in Alexandria by Didymus in terms which are reminiscent of the teaching of Athanasius.

Perhaps the clearest statement of the Spirit's deity belonging to the pre-Cappadocian period is that of Epiphanius: "There is one true God, Trinity in Unity; one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit." § ". . . We call the Father God, the Son God, and the Holy Spirit God." ‖ The Spirit is "of the same essence as the Father, of the same divinity . . . for the Spirit is of God, of the Father, of the Son, not by admixture, as the soul and body in us, but He is in between the Father and Son, from the Father and Son, third in title . . . since there is one seal of the Trinity, it follows that there is one virtue of divinity in the Trinity." ¶ ". . . That is called Holy Trinity in which are Three, but they are One by consent of the Three, one divinity of the same virtue and the same substance." ** In the first of the two creeds attached to the *Ancoratus* (written by 374) appears for the first time the definition of the Holy Spirit which is

* *Ad Serap.* i. 31. † *Ibid.* iv. 4; cf. i. 25. ‡ *De Trin.*
§ *Anc.* 2. ‖ *Ibid.* 6. ¶ *Ibid.* 8. ** *Ibid.* 67.

attached to our version of the Nicene Creed, "The Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified." In his final work, which deals with the various forms of Arianism, he uses language which appears in our so-called Athanasian Creed: "The Father is unbegotten, uncreated, incomprehensible; the Son is begotten, but uncreated and incomprehensible; the Holy Spirit is neither begotten nor created . . . but of the same substance with the Father and the Son." *

With the rise of the Cappadocian School, the literature of the Holy Spirit was, as we have seen, separated from that of the Logos. Basil says that if the Spirit is third in dignity and rank, He is not third in nature.† In his work *On the Holy Spirit*, he deals with this question at great length. Names which are ranked in the same co-ordinate series must be con-numerated, no one of them can be sub-numerated. So the Spirit is rightly glorified with the Father and the Son.

The Cappadocian writers grappled directly with the subordination theories of the Arians. If the Spirit is a person, He must be a divine person, He is not subordinate to either Father or Son. Moreover, they repeatedly contrasted Him with created beings. Gregory of Nyssa wrote, "To regard the Son and Spirit as created beings is to renounce the hope of entering upon a higher life at baptism, for mere creatures cannot raise men to a level above their own." ‡ Gregory of Nazianzus, in a discussion of the various types of Arian teaching, summarises his own views

* *Hær.* lxxiv. 12. (The *Panarion.*)
† *Ad Eunomium*, iii. 1. ‡ *Orat. Catech.* xxxix.

by saying that the being of the Spirit is necessary to the being of the Godhead, "there is something lacking in the Godhead if it have not the Holy, and how can it have this if it have not the Spirit?" * The Spirit's divinity is implied in His personality. "If He is a person He must be either creature or God, He cannot be something between the two. If He is a creature, how can we believe in Him, or be perfected by Him?" † With this antithesis he states the dilemma to which the teaching of Origen brought the Church.

On the question of the Spirit's divinity the School of Antioch followed that of Cappadocia. The doctrine of the Spirit's divinity occurs in the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom and Nestorius.

By the end of the fourth century the question of the Spirit's divinity had been settled in the East. The problem of His relation to the Father and the Son—the "procession" doctrine—still caused difficulty, and we shall see that the Antiochene School failed to support the Cappadocians, and came into conflict with Cyril of Alexandria on this question.

Meantime, in the West little serious attempt was made in the fourth century to deal with the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity before the time of Augustine. The elaborate work of Hilary *On the Trinity* is devoted mainly to Trinitarian problems. Ambrose contributed nothing that was original. Though he devotes much space to the operation of the Spirit in the Church and on the human heart, his writing is that of a busy man, who has absorbed the results of his study, and then delivers them in plain straightforward terms for his readers.

* *Or. Theol.* v. 4. † *Ibid.* v. 7.

The greatest contribution made by the Western Church to the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity came from Augustine (354–430). Not the least valuable feature in his work is the fact that, like Athanasius and Epiphanius, he treats the doctrine from a general standpoint. He supplies us with a theology of the Spirit, not a mere pneumatology. He treats the doctrine of the Spirit always in relation to the Father and the Son. But he writes rather of the Trinity than of the Spirit. By means of this method he gave the doctrine of the Spirit its proper place in the theology of the Church, and built it into the foundations as well as the superstructure of what has become known as Augustinianism.

In the *De Fide et Symbolo* (393) Augustine wrote, "The Holy Spirit is not of a nature inferior to the Father and Son, but, so to say, con-substantial and co-eternal . . . nor ought we to affirm that He is anything else than God." . . . "We should call the Father God, the Son God, the Holy Spirit God, and yet not affirm three Gods." * In 396 he wrote the *De Doctrina Christiana*, and repeated his earlier teaching. "Each person of the Trinity is God. Each is full essence, and altogether one essence . . . the Three have the same eternity, immutability, majesty, power." † In the *Sermones* he speaks of the Spirit as being the "common life ‡ of Father and Son" § (an idea expressed also by Epiphanius ‖ and Gregory of Nazianzus), ¶ and as "Himself God." In this Trinity "none is greater or less than another," there is

* *De Fid. et. Sym.* ix.
‡ *Communitas.*
‖ Cf. *supra*, p. 103.
† *De Doc. Christ.* i. 5.
§ *Sermon* 71.
¶ Cf. *Or. Theol.* v. 8.

"no separation of working, no dissimilarity of substance. The Father, Son and Holy Ghost are not three Gods, but one God; each Person is God, and the Trinity itself is one God." * "Let us believe also in the Holy Spirit, for He is God." †

His great work *On the Trinity* is occupied, so far as the doctrine of the Spirit is concerned, mainly with the doctrine of the procession, but the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity is comprised within the aim of the book.

Augustine develops an idea of the unity of the three persons in the Trinity which had been previously suggested by Athanasius.‡ The three persons work indivisibly.§ All that is referred to God in regard to the substance, refers to each person severally.‖ This teaching was developed by later writers into the doctrine of "inter-penetration" or "co-inherence." Each person inter-penetrates the others and contains the others. Thus the "whole Trinity is present in each of the persons." ¶ By means of this idea Augustine can say that the persons are not the Trinity, but the Trinity can be called also Holy Spirit, because all the three are God and Spirit and Holy.** Gregory of Nazianzus had already spoken of the "Holiness" of the Spirit as an attribute of the whole Godhead,†† but when expressed in Augustine's terminology, no statement conveys more completely the idea of the Spirit's divinity.

* *Sermon* 214. † *Sermon* 215; cf. 214.
‡ *Or. c. Arian.* ii. 33, 41; iii. 1–6. *Ad Serap.* i. 19.
§ *De Trin.* iv. 30. ‖ *Ibid.* iv. 10.
¶ Bethune-Baker, *Early Hist. Christ. Doc.*, p. 226, n. 2. The technical terms are περιχώρησις or circumincessio.
** *De Trin.* v. 12. †† Cf. *supra*, p. 105.

Since the time of Augustine, no development of the doctrine of the Spirit's *divinity* has taken place in either East or West.* At the Reformation there was a revival of belief in His activity through the inspired word of Scripture, and through His operation on the individual life, especially at conversion, and these practical activities of the Spirit received full recognition from the seventeenth-century Puritans and the eighteenth-century Pietists, and from the leaders of the Evangelical Revival. The Reformers of the sixteenth century, and their successors in later times, have accepted without question the teaching of the ancient Fathers on the personality and divinity of the Spirit, with the exception of the Socinians (who in the seventeenth century revived the Arian interpretation) and since the Reformation little attention has been paid by speculative philosophy to the doctrine of the Spirit.

* Cf. Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church*. Discussion on the doctrine of the Spirit continued throughout the Middle Ages. But when the wrappings of scholastic thought are removed, no development of the ancient teaching remains.

CHAPTER X

THE SPIRIT IN THE BEING OF GOD—THE PROCESSION DOCTRINE

WHILE the ancient Fathers were working out the doctrines of the Spirit's personality and divinity, a further question arose. If He was a divine person, what was His relation to the Father and the Son in the being of the Godhead? It soon appeared that a distinction similar to that made in relation to the Son had to be made between the earthly manifestation of the Spirit and His pre-earthly existence. If the Son was born as a man at Bethlehem, the Spirit was "sent" at Pentecost, but neither the birth at Bethlehem nor the "mission" at Pentecost constituted the beginning of existence for the Son and the Spirit. From one point of view the development of the doctrine of the eternal existence of the Spirit was easier than in the case of the Son. Whatever may have been the belief of the Jews, the ancient Fathers certainly believed that the Holy Spirit had assisted in the creation of the world,* and had inspired the prophets of the Old Testament, whereas there was no Old Testament teaching to support the doctrine of the Son's existence before Bethlehem. It is true that this argument only

* Gen. i. 2, and passages mentioned *infra*, p. 143, footnote.

places the Spirit's existence one stage farther back, He may not have come into existence until creation. But the belief of the early Church in relation to the Spirit's work in creation, and in the prophets, prepared the way for later speculation.

The problem was not realised until the doctrine of the Spirit's divinity came into prominence. To have established His personality did not necessarily imply any eternal relationship to the Father and Son. As the first of the angels or heavenly beings, He might have been created for the special function assigned to Him in creation. But investigation into the problem of the Spirit's divinity necessitated inquiry into His relationship to Father and Son.

The problem did not arise in the Sub-Apostolic age or in the time of the Greek Apologists. The first Western writer to discuss the question seriously was Tertullian. The argument of this writer was that as the Son is related to the Father, so is the Spirit to the Son.* The Spirit is third from God and the Son, just as the fruit of the tree is third from the root, and the stream of the river is third from the fountain-head, and the apex of the ray is third from the sun.† The Spirit coheres in the Son, as the Son coheres in the Father.‡ He does not use the word " proceeded " of the Spirit, but he does use it of the Son. At the same time his statement that the Spirit is " no otherwise than from the Father through the Son " not only expresses the procession doctrine in its earliest form, but makes use of a phrase which afterwards became the definition of the Eastern form of the doctrine.

* Quoting John xiv. 11.
† *Adv. Praxeam.* 8. ‡ *Ibid.* 25.

Origen carries the doctrine a stage farther by describing the relationship of the Spirit to the Father as one of procession. He speaks of "God the Father, from whom both the Son is born and the Holy Spirit proceeds." * . . . "The Holy Spirit, through whom all things are sanctified, who proceedeth from the Father." † Moreover, from his statement that the words used of Father, Son and Holy Spirit transcend all time, all ages and all eternity,‡ we may conclude that he held that the procession of the Spirit was eternal. He appears to base his argument upon the eternal "generation" or "Sonship" of the Son,§ but by laying the foundation for the doctrine of the eternal procession of the Spirit, he made a weighty contribution to orthodox Christian theology.

Athanasius also avoids describing the Spirit as proceeding from the Son. He uses the term "procession" to express the relation of the Spirit to the Father. "If they thought rightly concerning the Word, they would also think rightly of the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father, and being of the same nature as the Son, is given by Him to all disciples who believe in Him," ‖ and again, the Holy Spirit "is said to proceed from the Father." In another statement Athanasius uses the orthodox Greek formula of the fourth century by describing the Spirit as "through the Son." ¶

Didymus makes more use of the term "procession." He emphasises, with Athanasius, the procession of the Spirit from the Father, and with Origen, His eternal procession: "He comes proceeding without beginning

* *De Princ.* i. 2. † *Ibid.* iii. 5. ‡ *Ibid.* iv. 28.
§ *Ibid.* iv. 28. ‖ *Ad Serap.* i. 2. ¶ *Ibid.* iii. 5.

from the Father" * . . . "the Holy Spirit alone has proceeded from His essence without beginning and without break." † His origin is one of procession not creation. This procession is not attributed to Him because of His title "Spirit of God," but because He shares in the divine essence. ‡ A distinction is drawn between the nature of the Son and that of the Spirit. The Son is Only-Begotten, the Spirit "proceeds," § and is "co-existent with Him from whom He proceeds." "He proceeded from God and from the hypostasis of the Father, and was not begotten as the Son." ||

In the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius we possess the most striking statement of the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit, coming from the Greek writers of the fourth century. The double procession of the Spirit from both Father and Son is clearly stated, in terms which might have come from a Western writer of the next century. He begins with the moderate statement that the Holy Spirit is "proceeding from the Father and receiving from the Son," ¶ but continues, "the Spirit is from the Father *and* the Son," ** and then says without hesitation, "Christ is believed (to be) from the Father, from God; and the Spirit, who is from *both*, is therefore from Christ," †† and repeats the phrase, "the Holy Spirit from both." ‡‡

It is true that in the first Epiphanian Creed he is content with the phrase, "The Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and Son together is worshipped and glorified."

* *De Trin.* i. 12. † *Ibid.* ii. 1. ‡ *Ibid.* i. 2.
§ *Ibid.* i. 3. || *Ibid.* i. 5. ¶ *Anc.* 6.
** *Ibid.* 9. †† *Ibid.* 67. παρ' ἀμφοτέρων. ‡‡ *Ibid.* 70.

Swete points out that Epiphanius "seems to avoid the phrase 'proceeding from the Father and the Son,'" and describes his teaching as being "not very far from the Filioque," * but if words have any value, he could not have stated the "Filioque" doctrine in his other writings more clearly or more uncompromisingly than by saying that the Spirit proceeds "from both."

The Cappadocians contributed little to the development of the procession doctrine. Basil † and Gregory of Nazianzus are content with the statement that the Spirit proceeds from the Father. But in the teaching of Gregory of Nyssa may be seen the elements of the characteristic Eastern teaching of procession from the Father *through* the Son. The Spirit is derived not immediately from the Father, but mediately through the Son. The Cappadocians distinguished, like Origen, procession from generation, and like Origen described it as an eternal process, but they shrank from deriving, with Epiphanius, the Spirit's being from the Son save as a mediate derivation. Their attitude is reflected in the Constantinopolitan Creed of 381, which was content to describe the Spirit as "proceeding from the Father."

The hesitation of the Cappadocians became open denial in the writings of the Antiochenes. Theodore of Mopsuestia declared, "We neither regard the Spirit as a Son, nor as having received His subsistence through the Son." ‡ In his controversy with Cyril

**The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 229.

† In two works on the Procession doctrine, published in 1873 and 1876 (Cambridge), Swete over-emphasised the contribution of Basil to the development of this doctrine.

‡ Hahn-Harnack, p. 302, quoted by Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 258.

of Alexandria, Theodore wrote, "If Cyril means that the Spirit has His subsistence from or through the Son, we reject this as blasphemous and impious." * This, indeed, was Cyril's teaching. "He is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son, seeing that He is poured forth by way of essence from both, or in other words, from the Father through the Son." † The last clause "from the Father through the Son," reveals Cyril's caution, but the phrase "from both," although modified by what follows, went beyond the accepted Eastern teaching.

The doctrine of the double-procession of the Spirit was developed not by the Eastern, but by the Western Church. It was vaguely perceived by Hilary of Poitiers, in the middle of the fourth century, who said that the Spirit is to be confessed as coming from "the Father and the Son as originators." ‡ But Hilary declines to speak of "procession from the Son." We receive little or no help from the writings of Ambrose, and even the teaching of Augustine on the procession doctrine is not altogether clear. "The fact that the Holy Spirit was sent by the Father is evidence that He proceeds from the Father. Nor can we say that He does not also proceed from the Son, for the statement that He is the Spirit both of the Father and of the Son would then be meaningless; nor is it easy to see what else the Lord could have meant by breathing on His disciples and saying, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost'; the act was a fitting symbol, intended to show that the Spirit proceeds not from the Father only, but from the Son. Yet the Lord does not say,

* Migne, *P.G.*, lxxvi. 432.
† *De Ador.* i.
‡ Patre et filio auctoribus.

'Whom the Father will send from Me,' but, 'Whom I will send from the Father'; for the Father is the source of the whole Godhead * . . . the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and is sent by both," but then Augustine contradicted the double-procession doctrine by adding, "but He had His origin from the Father." †

Later on, in the same work, Augustine attempts to overcome his difficulty by speaking of Father and Son as together forming a single source of the Spirit. "The Father and Son are a beginning of the Spirit, not two beginnings." ‡ . . . "There has been much discussion of the question whether the Father is the source of the Spirit as well as of the Son; the source, that is, not only relatively to that which He begets or makes, but also to that which He gives. . . . If the gift has its source in Him who gives it, then must it be admitted that the Father and the Son are the source of the Spirit; not two sources, but relatively, to the Spirit, one source as they are one God." § But in this case the Spirit must be His own source, because He also, with the Father and Son, is "one God."

Augustine continues in a later chapter, "as the Father hath in Himself the power to give procession to the Holy Spirit, so He has given to the Son the same power. Hence, when the Holy Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, it is to be understood that He proceeds also from the Son . . . the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father as His source; and by the Father's gift, with-

* *De Trin.* iv. 29.
† *Ibid.* iv. 29; cf. xv. 17.
‡ *Ibid.* v. 15.
§ *Ibid.* vi. 7.

out any interval of time, proceeds in common from both." * But, we may ask, if the Spirit proceeds "from the Father as His source," how does He "proceed from both"? Yet in his confutation of the Eastern doctrine of procession from the Father through the Son, he says, "The Holy Spirit does not proceed first from the Father into the Son, and then from the Son to sanctify the creature, but He proceeds simultaneously from both; although it is by the Father's gift that He proceeds from the Son also, as from the Father himself." † Thus it appears that a double procession is what Augustine really has in mind, and the full Western doctrine of the "Filioque," or procession of the Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, has now been developed, and certainly the Church since Augustine's time has used his teaching as the authoritative interpretation of the double-procession doctrine.

Like other writers, Augustine confused the term "Father" with the term "God." On the orthodox theory of the Trinity the three persons share in Godhead and are God. To equate the term God with any of the three persons is to deprive the Godhead of two constituents of its Being. Yet the confusion of thought is characteristic of every early writer. It lay behind the Eastern form of the procession doctrine. The Father was regarded as the source of Godhead, from which both Son and Spirit derived their being. Moreover, the whole discussion, in both East and West, was vitiated by the use of the terms "source" and "origin," for while neither in East nor West did the orthodox writers interpret these terms to mean

* *De Trin.* xv. 47. † *Ibid.* xv. 48.

" beginning," yet they did imply subordination of the Son and Spirit to the Father. If the Spirit proceeds from both, the relationship does not imply, on the Trinitarian principle, subordination. It expresses no more than a relationship in the Godhead, a relationship special to the Spirit. Neither Son nor Spirit derive " Godhead " from the Father. The right faith is that Father, Son and Spirit share in Godhead, and, together with the Father, are God.

CHAPTER XI

LATER HISTORY OF THE PROCESSION DOCTRINE

FROM the time of Augustine the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from both Father and Son was the theory accepted by Western writers to explain the relationships of the Spirit in the being of God. But it was long before the doctrine entered the Western version of the Nicene Creed. The exact date of its insertion has never been satisfactorily determined. Moreover, although the theologians of the Roman Church accepted the teaching of Augustine, yet it was the Church in Gaul, North Africa and Spain which, at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth centuries, first officially recognised the doctrine, and admitted the formula "Filioque" (and from the Son) into the local creeds of those regions.*

To the Church in Spain we owe the most explicit treatment of the procession doctrine. Local circumstances compelled the Spanish Church to adopt a more dogmatic attitude than the rest of the Western Church. Priscillian and his supporters in the fourth and fifth centuries revived the Sabellian or Unitarian heresy, and the Visigoths carried Arian teaching into Spain. In the decrees and creeds of the Spanish

* *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, pp. 341 ff.

Councils, which were called together from the sixth century onwards to deal with these heresies, the "Filioque" clause was for the first time formally adopted. At the Second Council of Toledo (447),* at the Council of Braga (563), and particularly at the Third Council of Toledo (589) the clause was used. At this Council it was inserted in the Constantinopolitan version of the Nicene Creed, and orders were given for it to be recited at Mass throughout Visigothic Spain. At the same time the adoption of the "Filioque" in the Creed cannot be pinned down to the Toletan Council of 589 as a *terminus post quem.* It was in use before that date. In the next century Spanish Councils confirmed the new definition. It appears in the acts of the Sixth Council of Toledo (628), the Eleventh Council of Toledo (675), and the Fourteenth Council of Toledo (688), to mention only three of which we possess the decrees. The teaching of Isidore of Seville is especially clear. "The Holy Spirit is called God because He proceeds from the Father and the Son and has their essence . . . there is, however, this difference between the generation of the Son and the procession of the Spirit, that the Son is begotten of One but the Spirit proceeds from Both." † And he repeats Augustine's description of the Spirit as the bond of unity between Father and Son.

Meanwhile the doctrine was making its way into other parts of the West. It was accepted in England at the Council of Hatfield (680),‡ where it may have been introduced by Augustine of Canterbury or by

* Harnack, *History of Dogma*, iv. p. 133, for the date.
† *Etymol.* vii. 3.
‡ Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession.*

Abbot Hadrian. It was accepted by the Frankish Councils of Gentilly (767), Frankfurt (794), and Aix (809),* probably through the influence of Paulinus, Bishop of Aquileia, who was at the court of Charles the Great.†

The Roman Church, while giving its assent to the teaching of Augustine, did not so readily allow the "Filioque" to be inserted into the Creed. Leo the Great taught that the Spirit proceeds from "both" Father and Son.‡ Paschasius (d. 512) repeats the teaching of Isidore of Seville. The doctrine appears in the writings of Cassiodorus (d. 604), whose influence throughout the Western Church, both in his own day and in later times, was largely instrumental in securing its acceptance. He says, "Our Lord shows how the Spirit of both so proceeds as to be co-eternal with both"; "He who is produced by procession is not posterior in time to those by whom He is put forth"; § "The Spirit proceeds essentially from the Son . . . the Redeemer imparted to the hearts of His disciples the Spirit who proceeds from Himself." ‖

But the Roman Church avoided the insertion of the clause "and from the Son" in the Nicene Creed for many centuries. It does not appear in two copies of the Creed, in Latin and Greek, set up by Leo III, in S. Peter's at the beginning of the ninth century.¶ It is probable that this clause, which, as we have seen, was inserted in the Spanish versions of the Creed, did not appear in the Roman version until the time of Benedict VIII in 1017.

* Bethune-Baker, *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 216.
† Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Re-union*, p. 183. ‡ *Ep.* 15. § *Mor.* xxv. 4.
‖ *Ibid.* ii. 92; i. 22. ¶ Mansi, xiv. 17–42.

The Eastern Church to this day has not accepted the doctrine of the Spirit's procession from the Son as well as from the Father. The Council of Chalcedon (451) added nothing to the Constantinopolitan (381) revision of the Nicene Creed. The Sixth Ecumenical Council (680) at Constantinople adopted the same attitude. At the beginning of the eighth century John of Damascus drew up his well-known summary of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, a statement which has become the orthodox standard of the Greek Church. He says, "We believe in one Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father and resteth in the Son, the object of equal adoration and glorification with the Father and the Son, since He is co-essential and co-eternal; the Spirit from God . . . existing as God and addressed together with Father and Son . . . in all things like to the Father and the Son, proceeding from the Father, communicated through the Son and participated in by all creation . . . personal, existing in a personality which is His own, yet inseparable and indivisible from the Father and Son, possessing all the qualities which the Father and the Son possess, save that of Unbegottenness or Begottenness . . . the Holy Spirit is derived from the Father, not after the manner of generation but after that of procession. We have been taught that there is a difference between the two, but the nature of the difference we in no wise understand. The generation of the Son from the Father and the procession of the Spirit are simultaneous. All that the Son has, and that the Spirit has, each has from the Father, even His very being; and in their personal properties alone the three holy persons differ, not in

essence, but in that which characterises their several persons; this distinguishes them, yet so that it leaves them undivided." . . . "We speak of the Son as from the Father, and the Son of the Father; and, similarly, we say that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and we call Him the Spirit of the Father; we call Him also the Spirit of the Son, but we do not speak of Him as from * the Son," but "The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father to the Son," He is "The Spirit of the Son, not as being from Him, but as proceeding through Him from the Father." He is "God, intermediate between the Unbegotten and the Begotten, and connected with the Father through the Son." †

In this statement John of Damascus summarised Eastern teaching, and the Eastern Church has never advanced beyond his position.‡ It has been content to speak of the procession of the Spirit from the Father "by" § the Son or "through" ‖ the Son. Anselm attempted to persuade the Orthodox Church to accept the Western doctrine at the Synod of Bari (1098). But although more than thirty attempts at reunion were made in the Middle Ages, Eastern Christendom refused to go beyond what it believed to be the teaching of Scripture.¶ Whether one condition of the restoration of complete communion

* ἐκ.

† *De Fide Orthodoxa* i. 8; cf. i. 7 and another passage in i. 8.

‡ But the Jacobite Church of the Far East held the doctrine of the double procession; cf. Swete, *D.C.B.*

§ παρά. ‖ διά.

¶ There were other theological causes of disunion. For the theological and political causes of schism between East and West, cf. Louis Brehier, *Camb. Med. History*, vol. iv. pp. 247–273 and 594–636.

between East and West will prove to be some modification of the Western doctrine of the Holy Spirit remains to be seen. But at least the Orthodox Church can point to the authority of Scripture when it claims that the only scriptural reference to the procession of the Spirit confines this relationship to the Father (John xv. 26). Scripture only speaks of a mission or sending by the Son (John xv. 26 and xvi. 7). On the other hand, the Western doctrine is based upon two express implications of Scripture. The Spirit is spoken of in the New Testament * as the Spirit of Jesus, *i.e.* the Spirit of the Son ; and Jesus more than once, according to S. John, spoke of Himself as one with the Father (John x. 30 ; xiv. 10).† Thus, if the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Son, and if the Son shares in the Godhead of the Father, both doctrines imply that the Spirit proceeds from the Son as well as from the Father. Moreover, no other conclusion can be drawn from the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity and Unity in Trinity. It is not suggested that the Eastern Church is unsound on that doctrine. That the Spirit shares in the Trinity, like the Father and Son, is made clear in the writings of its great teachers from the time of Athanasius onwards. But it fails to agree with the Western Church in the details of definition. In its definition of the relationship existing between the persons of Son and Spirit within the being of God, inasmuch as that is a problem which has never been satisfactorily solved or even illustrated, and perhaps never can be, it seems reasonable that the Western Church should relax the stringency of its demand and take steps to meet the Eastern Church, by adapting,

* Cf. *supra*, p. 69 for refs. † *Supra*, p. 23 for refs.

in some form, its statement of the relationships existing between the three persons of the Trinity as a procession of the Spirit from the Father "by" or "through" the Son.

That this is possible has been proved by two attempts to find a basis of agreement made in more recent times. At the Council of Florence (1438–9), and again at a Conference held at Bonn in 1875 between the representatives of the Anglican and Eastern Churches, under the presidency of Dr. Dollinger, the Old Catholic writer, the statement of John of Damascus was accepted by both parties as a basis of agreement.*

Both Western and Eastern definitions created difficulties. The Eastern Church objected that the "Filioque" clause subordinated the Spirit to the Son. If the Son is a source of the Spirit, the Spirit must be inferior to the Son. On the other hand, the Western Church may reply that procession through the Son or by the Son subordinates the Son to the Father, and that was the crux of the Arian controversy, and a doctrine against which the East struggled with the whole of its resources. Indeed, this difficulty has never been satisfactorily overcome. If the Father is the source either of Son or Spirit, then no matter though we speak of generation or procession as *eternal*, the priority of the Father is implied even though the priority be an eternal condition. Should we not rather speak of three persons as being three eternal relationships, all of them existing

* Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Re-union*, p. 183. At the recent Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, the representatives of the Orthodox Church affirmed that the Eastern Church could not accept the "Filioque" clause.

eternally in conjunction, through whom the Godhead manifests Itself? Then is the Father eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Spirit eternal, and none is before or after another, none greater or less than another. If the Godhead is to be distinguished from the conjunction of the persons, all we can say is that the Godhead is immanent in the three persons, and is the bond of their unity. Need we go further? The functions of the three persons are differentiated to meet the needs of man. So the Fatherhood of God meets man's need of paternal provision and supervision; the Sonship of God meets man's need of brotherhood or fellowship with the divine, indeed the term "Son," and all the sayings of Jesus which express the filial relationship, should probably be restricted to the incarnate life of Jesus; the Spirit of God meets man's need of sanctification and inspiration.

Certain it is that, without the incarnate life of Jesus, Sonship would never have been conceived as a condition within the being of God by any lofty theistic system, and the doctrine of the divine Sonship of Jesus of Nazareth is, of course, the stumbling-block in the way of both Jew and Muhammedan when they approach the Christian system. By removing this difficulty we should not indeed have escaped the charge of tritheism, which both Jew and Muhammedan bring against us, but we should have cleared away the difficulty created by language which appears to set up paternal and filial relationships in God, which savour of human relationships. Tritheism is escaped by means of the doctrine of the one Godhead, which is immanent in the three persons, and never transcends them. Nor do the persons ever transcend the God-

head, they rest in the divine being, three centres of existence, of separate personal identity, fulfilling three separate functions. What their relationships are to each other we have no means of knowing, for when Jesus spoke of "My Father" He probably expressed the relation of His humanity to God.*

By means of this conception the subordination of one person to another is avoided. It derives the divinity of Son and Spirit not from the Father, but from the Godhead in which they subsist. They are their own source.† Arian conceptions, whether applied to the Son or to the Spirit, subordinated both Son and Spirit to the Father, because the Arians confused the person of the Father with the Godhead. Any one of the divine persons is less than the three-fold Godhead, and therefore logically subordinate to the Godhead, but when the Arians spoke of creation of the Son and Spirit by the Father, they expressed the subordination of the second and third persons in its crudest form.

The Catholic theologians were really in a similar dilemma, and through the same cause—a confusion of the first person with the whole Godhead. The adoption of the theory of eternal generation and eternal procession did not remove the difficulty, it only placed it a stage farther back. The Son and Spirit, although eternally derived from the Father, were subordinate to the Father in relation to their eternal source or eternal origin. But if all three persons exist eternally in the being of God, and, by reason of

* This is not, of course, the significance of the quotations from S. John (*supra*, p. 23), which are concerned not with filial relationship, but with Christ's divinity. They state His equality with the Father.

† Cf. *supra*, p. 115.

so existing, are God, then the question of hypostatic source or origin does not arise, and subordination of one to the others is avoided, nor can it be postulated of the three persons in relation to the Godhead, for beings who share in the common nature are not subordinate to that nature, unless we personalise the nature, and set up God or Godhead as a fourth term in the being of God.

The Eastern theologians have avoided all attempts to explain the relationships of the persons of the Trinity to each other by resorting to material illustration. On the other hand, the more concrete mind of the West has from the time of Tertullian frequently made the attempt. Tertullian spoke of the fruit and the tree and the root, or the sun and the ray and its apex. Augustine used the illustration from memory, understanding and will; or the lover, him who is loved, and the love which binds them together. There have been illustrations from water, snow and ice, and from iron: cold, red-hot and white-hot. Perhaps a more modern illustration may be suggested. Let us assume that a piece of "shot" silk contains three strands of colour instead of two—red, blue and green. The common quality of the three colours is "shotness," which expresses a unity, existing in all three colours, and a unity which could not exist without the juxtaposition of the three. At the same time, when viewed from different positions, the silk appears to be either "redness" or "blueness" or "greenness," or at least to possess a predominance of one of these colours, and so manifests separately the three elements of which the "shotness" is composed. The illustration, of course, breaks down, firstly because "shot

silk" is only composed of two colours, and secondly because there are three fundamental elements, not one in the "shotness," so transposing, numerically, element and condition in the illustration. In the doctrine of the Trinity the fundamental element or essence is one (God), while the conditions are three (persons). Yet if these contingent difficulties may be allowed to be waived, the illustration has force as an expression of a unity composed of three things existing in a special relationship to each other, a unity in which the three constituent things are not obliterated. The Godhead consists of three persons in relation * to each other and to human life; but the persons form a union in the Being of God which overcomes the distinction in a manner impossible to three human beings. Unless we conserve the tri-personality of God, God becomes a lonely, cold, forbidding unity, the source of fatalism, the philosophic Absolute and almost an abstraction. Such a Being draws no love. Even the lofty monotheism of the Jew and Muhammedan has not created a love of God in their hearts. God is to the Jew the object of fear and to the Muhammedan the source of fate. To the Unitarian He is the Absolute. The God who is to draw the hearts of men cannot be a lonely Being, existing alone throughout eternity, intrinsically alone by virtue of nature and essence. Yet to speak of the three persons is to raise the charge of Tritheism. But the risk must be taken by the believer who makes the New Testament the source of his doctrinal belief.

To attempt to summarise the development of any

* Cf. Thomas Aquinas on relationship and personality in the Godhead. The relevant passages are quoted by: H. Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit in the Mediæval Church*, p. 165; and T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, p. 176.

body of doctrine is not easy. The snares surrounding the steps of generalisation are perhaps more numerous in this sphere than elsewhere. There is no regular stratification of doctrine in the process of its development—it rather outcrops when advancement has been achieved. Yet the development of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is comprised within certain roughly defined epochs. Centuries two and three were occupied with the question of His personality, century four with the problem of His divinity, and centuries five and six with the theory of His procession. Yet the final form of the doctrine of His personality did not "outcrop" until the days of the Cappadocians, but that was the period when His divinity occupied the chief attention of the Church. So, also, we find in the writings of Epiphanius one of the chief statements of the doctrine of the double-procession, and he belonged neither to the fifth century nor to the West.

CHAPTER XII

THE SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD TO-DAY *

HOWEVER widely the ancient Fathers differed from each other, and however violently the ancient critics of orthodox conceptions disputed about the growing body of doctrine, all were agreed upon the part played by the Spirit in the life of the individual and in the Church at large. But in so far as their teaching did not develop the teaching on the Spirit in the New Testament, except perhaps in relation to the Sacraments, it is unnecessary for our purpose to devote any more space to them. In the apostolic Church, the conception of the Spirit's agency upon human life was confined to ethical behaviour and spiritual growth, although the conviction that the Spirit was the source of prophetic inspiration and utterance, comprehended, in some measure, the intellectual faculties, within the range of the Spirit's operation. Of equal importance to-day is the revival of faith in the Spirit's capacity as a person to assist also with the developments of the personal, mental, and physical gifts of men and women, with the object of improving our work and service in the world.†

* Cf. Dr. Gore, *The Holy Spirit of the Church.*

† Cf. Dr. H. M. Relton in *Confirmation*, i. pp. 297, 304–313 (S.P.C.K.), on the interpretation of the grace of the Holy Spirit as a personal influence.

The first of these subjects—namely, the apostolic teaching on the Spirit's influence upon moral and spiritual development—has been dealt with in the first part of this book. For the second or more practical aspect of the Spirit's influence, guidance is forthcoming rather in the Old than in the New Testament. The Spirit is conceived in the Old Testament rather as the inspirer of practical activity than of moral fervour.*

The discussion of Old Testament teaching has been postponed partly because the Old Testament tells us but little of the personality of the Spirit ; † and to attempt to establish His personality has been one of our two main aims ; partly because, on the other hand, the Old Testament teaching on the relation of the Spirit of God to individual human life bears rather upon the practical religious needs of mankind than upon dogmatic or credal statements, and therefore more properly falls into the discussion at this point. If the Old Testament conception needs to be supplemented by the Christian idea of the Spirit's personality, the Christian consciousness to-day needs to revive the vivid sense of the Spirit's practical influence, characteristic of Old Testament religion, but it needs to recognise it as a personal influence.

Although there are no more than mere suggestions of the Spirit's personality in the Old Testament,‡ the idea of a divine spiritual personality was not unknown to the ancients and the times immediately preceding

* Cf. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 15–21.

† But cf. T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, Chapters I–III, for an account of the doctrine in Old Testament and Apocalyptic literature ; and the valuable section in E. F. Scott's *The Spirit in the New Testament*, Chapters I–II.

‡ Ezek. xxxvii. 14 ; Isa. xl. 13, 14 ; xlviii. 16 ; lix. 19 ; lxiii. 10–14 ; Hag. ii. 5 ; Zech. iv. 6.

the New Testament epoch. It appears among the Persians in the system of Zoroaster, among the Greeks in the teaching of the Stoics. The Greek mystery-religions taught that the Spirit came into new members at the time of their initiation, * although probably this conception was influenced by that of the Pythia,† the priestess of Apollo at Delphi, who was regarded as a spirit-inspired oracle. Talmudical literature, again, only faintly grasps the idea of the Spirit's personality, and it played a very small part in the Apocalyptic literature ‡ of the period between the Old and New Testament, but the ancient conception of the breath or energy or power of God which was called the Spirit of Jehovah—an impersonal manifestation of an attribute or quality of God—expresses most clearly, on the one hand, man's need of supernatural assistance, and on the other, the readiness of God to assist him.

Special manifestations of the human spirit or human activity, whether in the form of mental power, physical activity, or artistic skill were attributed by Old Testament writers to the Spirit of Jehovah. From this source man is supplied with wisdom,§ with power to interpret dreams,‖ to make and administer laws.¶ Poetic inspiration springs from the Spirit.** By the Spirit of Jehovah physical courage and military skill

* R. Birch Hoyle, Art. *Hastings' Encyl. of Religion and Ethics*; cf. T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, pp. 27 ff.

† Cf. W. K. Lowther Clarke, "The Virgin-Birth" (*Theology*, August 1926). The conception of the Pythia influenced Judaism through Philo. The "glossolalia" reported by S. Paul resembles Delphic inspiration. Cf. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 93–103, for an able discussion on "glossolalia."

‡ But cf. Wisd. i. 7; vii. 27; ix. 17; xii. 1.

§ Job xxxii. 8. ‖ Dan. iv. 8–9; v. 11.

¶ Gen. xli. 38; Num. xi. 17. ** 2 Sam. xxiii. 2.

are inspired, especially during periods of national disaster.* This is particularly manifested in the physical courage of Othniel,† of Gideon,‡ of Jephthah,§ of Samson,‖ and in the military strategy of Joshua.¶ He inspires architectural skill,** craftsmanship in precious stones and needlework,†† in silver, gold, brass, iron, stone and woodwork.‡‡ The Spirit of Jehovah meets the special needs of particular occasions.§§

So also, although not so emphatically, the needs of man's moral and religious consciousness are fulfilled by the Spirit's direction and inspiration.‖‖ Prayer is inspired,¶¶ prophecy is inspired,*** and Messiah will be endowed by the Spirit.††† The affairs of the nation are under the Spirit's guidance,‡‡‡ and the missionary influence of the inspired nation will be controlled by it.§§§ The Spirit pervades the world. ¶¶¶

Thus the Old Testament teaches that the Spirit of God is the source from which is perfected the physical power of the man possessing bodily strength; He is the source from which is perfected the fulness of mental activity of him who is able to perceive new ideas, who is able to read the meaning of nature, and to invent machines for harnessing the forces of nature to man's service; the source from which is perfected

* Judges, xiii. 25; xiv. 19; Isa. xxxii. 15.
† Judges iii. 10. ‡ Judges vi. 34. § Judges xi. 29.
‖ Judges xiv. 6; xv. 14. ¶ Num. xxvii. 18; Deut. xxxiv. 9.
** 1 Chron. xxviii. 12. †† Exod. xxviii. 3 ff.
‡‡ Exod. xxxi. 3 ff.; xxxv. 31. §§ 1 Kings xviii. 12.
‖‖ Ps. li. 11; cxliii. 10; Prov. xx. 27. ¶¶ Zech. xii. 10.
*** Num. xi. 25, 26, 29; 1 Kings xxii. 24; Isa. xxix, 10; xlviii. 16; Ezek. xi. 5; xxxvii; Mic. ii. 7.
††† Isa. xi. 2–6; xlii. 1; lxi. 1.
‡‡‡ Isa. xxxii. 15; xliv. 3; lix. 21; lxiii. 10, 11, 14; Ezek. xxxvi. 26–27; xxxvii. 14; xxxix. 29; Nehem. ix. 20.
§§§ Jiil. 28–29. ¶¶¶ Psa. cxxxix. 7.

the artistic skill of him who sees visions which others do not see, and is able to transfer them to canvas or stone, to wood or iron or all precious metals, or to the scroll of music. Yet we do not realise this source of energy, and we allow our gifts to operate, foreshortened of their full range, deprived of their full power, for lack of the inspiration which He who was sent by Jesus to take charge of us and all our doings is waiting to breathe into us.

So also, in our corporate life within the Church and without, in our political and industrial and social relationships, in our international dealings whether diplomatic or economic, He who shared with Father and Son the creation of the universe, and the ordering of the life of men ; He who has supervised the activities of communities, of nations and empires, through all the long history of man, waits till man consciously submits himself to His direction. So far, the Spirit of God has been able to do little, save to bring good out of the evil created by man, to restore concord after man's discord, to start him off now and again, after a period of devastation and ruin, upon the slow, hard, upward path of development. The history of man has been the setting up of the human will and the human spirit against the very Principle of the universe and of life ; * against the Principle of man's own being. Man has turned himself against his inward life, for when he has not been in direct opposition, he has ignored the life within him, and by neglecting the Spirit, has tried to achieve his destiny by human powers alone, with intermittent appeals to the Father or the Son, who, indeed, have not refused to help, but

* In biological terminology "epigenesis" expresses this idea.

who intended the Spirit to be the abiding guide and counsellor, the inspiration and strength of individuals, and through them, of the race. Let us address our prayers once more to the Spirit. The sense of the Spirit's personality and guiding influence grows with prayer. Let us give Him an equal place in our worship with Father and Son. Let us recall and make use of the second of the great channels of spiritual grace promised to us by the Son, and the only channel of inspiration offered as a practical guide for our common life and daily work.

How does the Spirit operate in man? What is the relation of the spirit of man to the Spirit of God? The doctrine of divine Immanence comes to our assistance. We have seen that the Godhead is immanent in the persons of Father, Son and Spirit. The condition of their deity is immanence. Divine personality is the immanence of Godhead differentiated in Father, Son and Spirit. While, then, the persons of the Trinity remain for ever transcendent to our nature because they are God, yet through the medium of the Spirit, God becomes immanent in man, and becomes active in man on the plane of human life. He becomes "God in action." An endowment of the Spirit is an endowment of divinity, and the only channel by which God can operate on human life is through the medium of Spirit-filled men and women. The history of the development of human thought and inventive genius during the last hundred and fifty years proves the contention. The laws of nature and the forces of nature were there from the beginning of creation. But human understanding did not grasp and make use of the significance of their presence, a

significance which was only to be won by scientific investigation and harnessed by inventive genius. All this was not achieved until the spirit of man gave itself to the study of God in nature. And although many of our leaders in this enterprise were blind to the true conditions of their work, yet even so the Spirit of God responded, and knowledge was given to man together with the power to harness nature's forces and make them serve the race. That is inspiration, the double process of man's contemplation of God, whether in nature or thought, and the response of the Spirit to man's effort. Whether it be Amos among the hills of Judæa, or Paul in the desert of Arabia, or Darwin on *The Challenger* and at Orpington, the process and results were similar. Although they may refuse to acknowledge the source of their achievements, yet the methods of our men of science have often been more truly those of the Kingdom of God than the methods of many sons of the Kingdom, for they have made truth and honesty and sincerity, and untiring industry, the mode of their work, to a degree which has not always been adopted by Churchmen or by any type of believer. And they have their reward, a reward in which we and all mankind share. This is no more than a fulfilment of the promise of Scripture, "Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it" (Ps. lxxxi. 10). With God there is no respect of methods or of beliefs, and no limit to the application of His benefits. But how much greater will the illapse of the Spirit be, and the achievements of the brain and spirit of man, when as a race he consciously places himself under the Spirit's influence! To bring mankind to a knowledge of this source of power is the task of the Church to-day,

but first must she gird up her own loins, and see that the members of her own house have felt the Spirit's power, and placed themselves unreservedly under His influence.

What is the process by which a man puts himself consciously under the Spirit's influence? The manifestations of the Spirit within those who profess and call themselves Christians have been so frequent and various in times gone by, that there appears to be no one clearly defined means of apprehending Him. From the days of the Montanist movement, in the second century, when men claimed a revival of the prophetic functions through His instrumentality; through the period of the mediaeval mystics,* down to the time of the Reformation, when both Luther and Calvin claimed that the Scriptures derived their authority, not from the Church but from the Holy Spirit; and on to the Pietism of the English Puritans of the seventeenth century,† and of Spener (d. 1705) and Francke (d. 1727), which revived personal religion by means of the Moravian movement in Germany, and by means of the Wesleyan movement and Evangelical Revival in England, the claim has been repeatedly made that the operation of the Spirit cannot be confined to any definite channel, sacramental or otherwise. Indeed, so complete was the freedom claimed by some of the Reformers for the Spirit's activity that Luther and Calvin denied any scope for human co-operation with the Spirit in the work of personal conversion, although Melanchthon took the opposite view. Luther said,

* Cf. Dr. H. M. B. Reid, *The Holy Spirit and the Mystics*; Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit in the Mediaeval Church.*

† Cf. T. Rees, *The Holy Spirit in Thought and Experience*, pp. 191–198.

"I believe that it is not of my own reason or by my own strength that I believe in Jesus Christ my Lord: it is the Holy Ghost that by the Gospel has called me, with His gifts has enlightened me, through genuine faith has sanctified and sustained me, just as He calls, gathers together, enlightens, sanctifies and sustains a Christendom by Jesus Christ, in true proper faith." * So also in the revival movements of modern days, there have been undoubted manifestations of the Spirit's power, exercised apart from the channels of grace used by the Catholic Church.

But for a large section of the Church there appears to be a regular means of initiation into the Spirit, which all must undergo, no matter how they may make use of other means of approach to Him. That initiation consists in two phases of the one process of spiritual regeneration, operated by the Sacrament of Baptism and the rite of Confirmation.† Our Lord's teaching is clear and incontrovertible. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God" (John iii. 5). The action of the apostles Peter and John at Samaria (Acts viii. 15–17), and of Paul at Ephesus (Acts xix. 2–7), shows that the apostolic Church interpreted these words to mean Baptism and Confirmation, not Baptism only. Irenæus,‡ Tertullian,§ and especially Cyprian ¶ interpreted the passage in the same way, and although

* R. Birch Hoyle in *Hastings' Encycl. of Religion and Ethics.* For the Reformation period, cf. Watkin-Jones, *The Holy Spirit Mediaeval Church.*

† The idea that Confirmation confers the gift of the Spirit was held without question until the time of Wyclif (Dr. A. J. Maclean, *Confirmation*, i., p. 48.)

‡ *Hær.* iv. 63. § *De Bapt.* 7, 8.

¶ *Ep.* 72. 1; cf. *Ep.* 70: 2, and 73: 9.

Swete refers to Cyprian's exegesis as a "strange interpretation of S. John iii. 5," * yet another modern authority, Dr. Gore, accepts the interpretation and makes it part of his teaching.† For all sections of the Church which practise infant Baptism, no other interpretation is possible. There must be some later rite, of a sacramental nature,‡ when a man definitely undertakes for himself the promises made for him in Baptism and consciously receives a confirmation of the gift of the Spirit already received in Baptism.§ Without Confirmation infant Baptism surely remains incomplete. With it, the new member of the Church has been fully initiated into the life of the Spirit. He completes at Confirmation an initiation into a way of life which demands from him constant renewal in later days, by means of his own conscious application to the Spirit for assistance.

But he is not only initiated into a way of life. He is equipped for service in the world. Thus Confirmation is equivalent to Ordination for secular men and women, the occasion when to them is offered, as to the deacon or the priest at Ordination,‖ the help of the Spirit to perform their special work in the world, no matter how secular or how humble it may appear to be. It is the occasion when the individual offers

* *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church*, p. 118

† *The Body of Christ* (3rd edit.), p. 42. *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 132.

‡ Confirmation was accompanied by anointing with oil from the second century to the Reformation (cf. Dr. A. J. Maclean in *Confirmation*, i. p. 25); cf. footnote to p. 12 for Dr. W. K. L. Clarke's comment.

§ On the doctrine of the Spirit in relation to Baptism, cf. Mr. K. D. McKenzie in *Confirmation*, i. pp. 286–287.

‖ Cf. Dr. A. J. Maclean in *Confirmation*, vol. i., p. 46, for similar teaching in the writings of the Fathers.

himself unreservedly to the service of God, through the service which he renders to man.

We do not usually fail in our recognition of the need for the initiatory rite of Confirmation, or for some equivalent which is loosely called conversion, but there is a tendency to regard Confirmation rather as an end than as the beginning of the process of sanctification. Confirmation is not a gift offered and received once for all. It is the beginning of our conscious access to the Spirit of God, to whom we are to turn repeatedly and methodically throughout the whole course of later life, for power to make use of the talents we possess and to fulfil the functions of our different activities.

If there is some recognition that the grace of Confirmation is renewed by the Communicant life, yet there is confusion of thought on the relation of the grace offered in Holy Communion to the grace offered by the Spirit who abides in the Church. If, as our Lord arranged, there are two channels of grace, there must be some distinction between them.

Doubtless, because the Spirit of Jesus, which is given to us in Communion, is the Spirit of the Godhead, it is from this aspect the Holy Spirit in so far as He also is God. But to allow the two persons to become interchangeable in this way is to adopt a theology which even the Monarchians avoided. They may merge the persons in their interpretation of the being of God, but they did not so merge them in their relationship to humanity. The distinction between the functions of Son and Spirit in the human sphere, was clearly maintained by Monarchian and Arian alike. Indeed, the teaching of the heretics on the grace of

Holy Communion and on the mission of the Spirit was orthodox.

It may be true that the Spirit mediates for us the spiritual presence of Jesus in the sacrament of the Eucharist,* although we have no scriptural authority for the theory, and can only hold it by implication from the doctrine of the general supervision assigned to Him by Jesus over all the activities of the individual Christian life and all the operations of the Church. In the Revised Prayer Book of the Church of England (1927) this function is allowed to the Holy Spirit. A special prayer called the Epiclesis petitions for the descent of the Spirit to bless the sacred Bread and Wine and the receivers of the same. This teaching has for long been that of other branches of the Anglican Church in Scotland, South Africa and America. But there must be some clearer distinction still if our Lord's two promises are to receive adequate fulfilment.

When Jesus offered His spiritual Presence to men in the Holy Communion, He was offering Himself from the unseen, from across the veil. The spiritual Presence of Jesus in the Holy Communion is a manifestation, on the plane of the human, of the Transcendent God. On the other hand, the spiritual grace offered to us by the Spirit of God who indwells the Church and the believer, is a spiritual presence offered to us in the realm of the *seen*, on this side of the veil. It is a manifestation of the Immanent God.

Thus is satisfied the human instinct, which at one time turns towards God who is transcendent, who is

* The Holy Spirit in Confirmation links up the two sacraments of Baptism and Communion by completing the one and forcing an entrance for the other. Cf. Dr. H. M. Relton in *Confirmation*, i. p. 321.

independent of the world and all its change and loss and failure; and which at another time turns towards God, who is Immanent, who is close at hand, sharing in all change and loss and failure. Our faith in the grace offered to us in Holy Communion scarcely needs re-emphasis to-day, but our faith in the grace offered by the indwelling Spirit needs revival.

On the question of reunion, a revival of belief in the Spirit's activity among all baptised believers would assist greatly towards a more amenable attitude in all parties. A basis of reunion may be formed by a fresh application, if not a new development, of this doctrine. A Church which is indwelled, guided, inspired by the one Spirit ought not to remain separated in distinct sections: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all." *

In addition to the liberty of mind brought by the Spirit to individuals,† one of the most striking features in the record of the apostolic Church was the freedom with which the Spirit made use of the opportunities presented by the events and conditions of the times. The first manifestations of the Spirit at Pentecost took place when Jews from all parts of the world were gathered at Jerusalem. In order to plant the Church in the Greek-speaking Roman world, S. Paul, a Greek-speaking Roman citizen, was chosen, albeit he was not a member of the original apostolic band, still less was he a Christian of the Jerusalem type. Yet the Spirit said, "Separate unto me Barnabas and Saul." ‡

* Eph. iv. 4–6. † Rom. viii. 2; 1 Cor. ii. 15; Gal. vi. 18.
‡ Acts xiii. 2.

Throughout his evangelisation S. Paul was conscious that the Spirit not only guided him, but made use of opportunities as they arose. Finally, at the Council of Jerusalem, the orthodox leaders felt constrained to relax the rules of the Jerusalem Church in favour of the Greek-speaking converts gathered in by S. Paul.*

As the severed branches of the Church approach reunion they will do well to recollect this practical opportunism of the Spirit manifested in the first years of the Church's history. It will be no legitimate reply to say that the Jerusalem apostles possessed plenary powers to deal with such problems, powers which no synod of bishops or committee of leaders possesses to-day. S. Paul and the Jerusalem Church acted not as authorities singly or collectively, empowered by virtue of their special office or by virtue of a special endowment from on high; they acted under the influence of the Spirit. The Spirit made the new rules. So also to-day the problems of reunion fall within the Spirit's function, the decision does not rest with the Church, but the Church can hinder the freedom of the Spirit's action by adhering rigidly to episcopal or presbyterian or congregational traditions. It is the duty of the Church to see that when the time comes for revision, restatement, readjustment and reapplication, no self-assertive love of present power and influence, and no legal or sentimental adherence to old traditions, shall impede the freedom of the Spirit's actions.

In conclusion we may note that no reference has been made to the Spirit's influence upon creation. This idea is rather a pious notion or tradition than a

* Acts xv.

doctrine which has any consistent authority in Scripture. It is true that in Gen. i. 2,* we are told that the "Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters," but that statement is to be read in the light of the impersonal conception of the Spirit characteristic of Old Testament teaching. Moreover, it has the character of the poetical statements or allusions frequently used in the early chapters of Genesis. The idea of the Spirit's work in creation appears to be excluded for the Christian theologian, by the express statement in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, that creation was effected by the Word or Son of God. It may be that the Old Testament idea agrees better with general Christian teaching on the function of the Spirit—teaching which marks off the world and the affairs of men both under the old and new dispensations, as being the special care of the Spirit—and that the idea of creation by the Word, if taken over from the Greek conceptions, really introduces a confusing notion into Christian theology; for, while the Greek idea of the Logos certainly assists towards clearness of thought, when the attempt to define the relation of the Son in the Being of the Godhead is made, yet probably Christian theology would have pursued a less devious and contradictory course if the more ancient Old Testament idea of the influence of the Spirit of God upon human affairs, and upon creation, had been adopted in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. At least the difficulty of reconciling Genesis i. and the Prologue would not have existed, and until that difficulty is overcome it is hard to deduce from the

* Cf. Job. xxvi. 13; xxxiv. 14, 15; Ps. xxxiii. 6; civ. 27 ff; Eccles. iii. 19; Isa. xl. 12–14.

New Testament a definite doctrine of the Spirit in Creation.*

From another quarter the modern biological doctrine of epigenesis—a revised form of Vitalism, which teaches that the differentiation of species arose through the influence of a self-directed, if not self-conscious, principle or energy of life within the organism —suggests a basis for a new development of the doctrine of the Spirit in Creation. Epigenesis is a biological term for the operation of the Spirit in evolution, and thus links up with the Old Testament suggestion of the Spirit's influence on Creation. But the question of the assistance to be rendered by biology, and the parallel question of the significance of modern psychology for the interpretation of the ancient doctrine of the Holy Spirit, still awaits an answer, although the way has been opened by Canon Raven's valuable Book.†

Again, if little attention has been paid by modern speculative philosophy to the doctrine of the Spirit, a new school of investigators has begun to examine the operations of the Spirit of God, especially in the matter of personal conversion, and in relation to mass movements. No definite conclusions have yet been reached. But a most valuable contribution, by way of an approach to the subject, has been made by the band of investigators gathered together a few years ago by Canon Streeter, some of whom are continuing their work independently.‡

* Dr. E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*, p. 190, suggests a similar treatment of this difficulty.

† *The Creator Spirit* (1927).

‡ *The Spirit* (ed. B. H. Streeter). The emotional effects of the Spirit upon individuals in New Testament and later days have, of

Behind such investigations lies the work of McDougall and Lloyd-Morgan. It is several years since Prof. McDougall discussed at length the independent existence of the psychic life of man,* and now in two recent works, † Prof. Lloyd-Morgan has brought forward his theory of "emergent evolution." In this theory Lloyd-Morgan gathers together the tendencies of modern biological and philosophical thought, and in the second of these works he applies his teaching to psychology. Thus are the modern prophets coming round to the ancient belief of the Church that the Holy Spirit has always been operating in the world and in man as the Life-giver, and in turn the Church awaits the results of further investigations by such inquirers who, although not officially representing her in their operations, yet are working under the influence of the same Spirit, who is the illuminator of her own knowledge, and the interpreter of her own traditions.

course, been discussed by pyschologists, but as these critics regard the phenomena as solely subjective, their views hardly come up for discussion in a dogmatic study.

* *Body and Mind* (first published, 1911).

† *Emergent Evolution* and *Life, Mind and Spirit*, both Gifford Lectures.

INDEX

Africa, North, 16*n.*
Alexandria (Synod), 98–99
Ambrose, 90, 105, 114
Ananias, 7, 8, 38
Anselm, 122
Antioch (Council), 83
Antiochenes, The, 88, 105, 113
Arians, The, 83, 85, 91, 92, 94, 96, 98, 99, 101–102, 104, 108, 118, 124, 126, 140
Aristides, 72
Arius, 82, 83, 98, 101
Athanasius, 85, 98, 101–103, 106, 107, 111
Athenagoras, 73, 93–94, 95
Augustine, 90, 106–107, 114–116, 118, 119, 120, 127
  of Canterbury, 119

Baptism, 25, 32, 54–55, 62, 63, 65, 138–139, 141*n.*
  of Jesus, 6, 12, 28, 42
Bari (Synod), 122
Barnabas, S., 9, 39
Basil, 86, 104, 113
Benedict VIII, 120
Biology, 145–146
Bonn, 124

Calvin, 137
Cappadocians, The, 82, 85, 88, 90, 104, 105, 113, 129
Cassiodorus, 120
Chalcedon (Council), 121
Charles the Great, 120
Chrysostom, 105
Clarke, Dr. W. K. L., 26, 27
Clement of Alexandria, 81, 96
Clement, Pseudo, 71
Confirmation, 32, 138–140
Communion, Holy, vii.–viii., 52–53, 66, 140–142
Constantinople (Council of 360), 99
  (Council of 382–383), 100
  (Council of 381), 91, 99, 113, 121
  (Council of 680), 121
Cornelius, 7, 8, 9, 38
Creation, 109, 143–145
Creeds (Antioch), 83; (Athanasian), 104; (Cæsarea), 101; (Constantinople), 91, 113, 119; (Nicæa), 99, 104, 118–119, 120, 121
Cyprian, 138
Cyril of Alexandria, 77*n.*, 83*n.*, 88, 105, 114
  of Jerusalem, 84

Damascus, 90
Danube, 100
Darwin, 136
Delphi, 132
Didymus, 85, 103, 111–112
Dionysius of Alexandria, 82–83, 98
  of Rome, 83, 98
Dollinger, Dr., 124

Ebionites, The, 72, 73
Ephesus, 9, 32, 38, 42
Epiclesis, viii, 141
Epiphanius, 85, 103–104, 106, 112–113, 129
Eunomius, 99
Eusebius, 83, 101
Eustathius, 99

Florence (Council), 124
Frankish Councils, 120

Glossolalia, 30
Gnostics, The, 73–75, 76, 94, 95
Gore, Dr., 139
Gratian, 99
Gregory of Nyssa, 86, 87, 104, 113
  of Nazianzus, 87, 104–105, 106, 107 113

Hadrian, Abbot, 120
Harnack, 71, 73, 75, 85, 92
Hatfield (Council), 119
Hermas, 71
Hilary, 105, 114
Hippolytus, 77

Immanence, 125, 135, 141
Inspiration, 43–51, 136
Irenæus, 74–76, 94–95, 138
Isidore of Seville, 119, 120

Jerusalem (Council), 8, 39, 44, 143
John S., 11, 32, 38, 62–66, 138
John the Baptist, 28–29, 32
John of Damascus, 89, 121–122, 124
Justin Martyr, 72, 81*n.*, 92–93

Kittel, 26

Lausanne Conference, 124*n.*
Leisegang, 26
Leo the Great, 120
Leo III, 120
Liberius, 99
Lloyd-Morgan, Prof., 145–146
Lombardy, 100
Luther, 157

Macedonius, 99
Magus, Simon, 38, 74
Marcellus, 101
Marriage, 61–62
Mary, 5, 12, 27
McDougall, Prof., 145–146
Melanchthon, 137
Ministry, The, 42–43
Monarchians, The, 76–78, 82, 87, 90, 96, 140
Montanists, The, 74*n.*, 137

Neo-Platonists, The, 80–81, 94, 96
Nestorius, 77*n.*, 83*n.*, 89, 105
New Testament, 45–49, 51, 53, 54, 67–70
Nicæa (Council), 84, 101
Nicodemus, 3, 31–32, 62
Novatian, 79, 96

Old Testament, 10, 12, 29, 45–47, 50, 53, 54, 84, 87, 88, 109, 131–134, 144, 145
Origen, 81–82, 86, 87, 96–98, 105, 111, 113

Paschasius, 120
Patripassians, The, 77*n.*
Paul, S., 8, 9, 32, 38, 39, 40, 42–44, 49, 50, 53, 55*n.*, 62–63, 65, 138, 142, 143
Paul of Samosata, 76, 87
Paulinius of Aquileia, 120
Pentecost, 3, 6, 8, 10–11, 29–30, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 109, 142
Peter, S., 7, 8, 11, 32, 38, 74, 138
Philip the Deacon, 8, 32
Plato, 74*n.*, 81, 93
Plotinus, 80
Prayer, 57–58
Prayer Book (Revised), viii, 141
Priscillian, 118
Prophecy, 43–51
Psychology, 145–146
Pythia, The, 132

Raven, Canon, 145
Reformation, 52, 108, 137–138
Re-union, 142–143

Sabellius, 77
Samaria, 11, 32
Sanctification, 52, 56–57, 60–62, 140
Sapphira, 7, 38
Serapion, 98
Socinians, The, 108
Spain, 100, 118
Spanish Councils, 119
Stephen, S., 8, 38
Stoics, The, 132
Streeter, Dr., 70, 145
Swete, 14, 34, 46–49, 113, 139

Tatian, 93
Temple, Dr., 4
Tertullian, 77*n.*, 78, 96–97, 110, 127, 138
Theodocius, 99
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 88, 105, 113–114
Theophilus, 72, 94, 95
Trinity, Holy, 22, 35, 80, 81, 86, 90, 92, 94, 96, 102, 103, 105–107, 116, 117, 123, 127–129

Valens, 99
Valentinians, The, 74
Valentinian, 99
Virgin Birth, 5, 12, 26–28

Westminster, 30

Zoroaster, 132

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

84054 231.38 M145
Macdonald, A. J.
The holy spirit issued 18 times on

231.3 S
M145

84054